



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-120
Thursday
21 June 1990

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-120

CONTENTS

21 June 1990

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

USSR Delegation Head Cited on CFE Talks <i>[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]</i>	1
'Complete Nuclear Test Ban' Said Possible <i>[TASS]</i>	1
USSR Suggests Nuclear-Free Baltic Sea <i>[IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]</i>	1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov 20 June Briefing on World Issues	3
On Bulgaria, Burma Elections <i>[TASS]</i>	3
Praises Mitterrand Interview <i>[TASS]</i>	3
On Ecological Problems in CSFR <i>[TASS]</i>	3
On Plane Hijacked to Finland <i>[TASS]</i>	3
London Poles Rehabilitated <i>[TASS]</i>	4
On Central American Peace Process <i>[TASS]</i>	4
On Group of 15 Appeal to Presidents <i>[TASS]</i>	4
'Diverse Problems' Discussed at CSCE Conference <i>[PRAVDA 17 Jun]</i>	5

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Aleksey Obukhov Meets CIA's John Helgerson <i>[TASS]</i>	6
Radio Discusses Future, Budget of CIA <i>[Moscow International]</i>	6
U.S. NEWS Claims on Gorbachev Talks Refuted <i>[TASS]</i>	6
Young U.S. Leaders To Visit 18-30 Jun <i>[PRAVDA 16 Jun]</i>	7
Gorbachev Message Read to Young Californians <i>[PRAVDA 20 Jun]</i>	7

China

PRC Vice Premier on Reunification With Taiwan <i>[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]</i>	8
PRC's Jiang Zemin on Durability of Socialism <i>[PRAVDA 19 Jun]</i>	8
PRC Minister Details Anticrime Campaign <i>[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]</i>	8
Agricultural Venture With PRC in Belorussia <i>[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]</i>	8

Northeast Asia

DPRK Nuclear Secrecy Gives Seoul Ideas <i>[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Jun]</i>	9
Preparations for Mongolian Election Assessed <i>[PRAVDA 16 Jun]</i>	9

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Cease-Fire, Khmer Rouge Role Viewed <i>[Alekseyev on Moscow International]</i> ..	10
Release of Burma's Suu Kyi, Tin U Urged <i>[Moscow International]</i>	10
Burma's Military Reluctant To Transfer Power <i>[Vladimirov on Moscow International]</i>	11

Near East & South Asia

Conflict Among Afghan Rebel Groups Increasing <i>[TASS]</i>	12
USSR To Abide by UN Zionism Resolution <i>[Amman AL-RAY 21 Jun]</i>	12
Patsev Appointed New Ambassador to Oman <i>[TASS]</i>	13

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopian Rebels Reject Government Peace Plan	[Moscow International]	13
Nigerian Debt for Metallurgical Plant Overdue	[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 19 Jun]	13

East Europe

Yeltsin Meets With Polish Sejm Marshal	[TASS]	14
Polish 'Anti-Soviet Tendencies' Examined	[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]	14
Poland's Mazowiecki on Free Market Plan	[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 13 Jun]	16
Yazov, Lizichev on All-European Security	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]	17
Moiseyev, Lizichev Meet GDR People's Army Group	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]	17
DSU 'Reckless Race' to German Unity Criticized	[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]	17
Bulgarian Opposition Tactics Criticized	[PRAVDA 16 Jun]	18
Second Round of Bulgarian Election Previewed	[PRAVDA 18 Jun]	20
Romanian Government 'Not Fully in Control'	[PRAVDA 18 Jun]	21
Calm Proves 'Deceptive'	[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]	21

West Europe

Shevardnadze Receives Austrian Vice Chancellor	[TASS]	22
Discuss All-Europe Security	[Vienna Radio]	22
Baden-Wuerttemberg Leader Meets With Officials		23
Discuss Economic Ties	[TASS]	23
Holds Talks With Gorshkov	[TASS]	23
Meets With Gorbachev	[TASS]	23
Shevardnadze on Two Germanys, NATO-Pact	[Vienna TV]	24
Possibility of Germany's NATO Membership Noted		
[Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLEGEMEINE 20 Jun]		24
Genscher Optimistic About Achieving Unity	[PRAVDA 20 Jun]	24
British, Soviet UN Groups Support End to Blocs	[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]	26
British Air Force Exhibition Slated for Kiev	[TASS]	26
Hijacked Airliner Returns From Helsinki	[TASS]	26
Voronin Meets With Turkey's Ozdemir 13 Jun	[TASS]	26
Soviet, French Regional Commanders Meet in FRG	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]	26
Supreme Soviet Delegation Arrives in France	[TASS]	27
Icelandic President Finnbogadottir Ends Visit	[PRAVDA]	27
Describes Relations	[Moscow TV]	27
More on Dutch Defense Minister's Visit	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jun]	27
Ter Beek Holds News Conference	[TASS]	28
Military Delegation Ends Visit to Belgium	[TASS]	28

Latin American & Caribbean

1,000 Nicaraguan 'Contras' Still To Surrender	[TASS]	28
Cuban Writer Cited on Perestroika	[PRAVDA 8 Jun]	28
Cuban Deputy Minister Interviewed on Relations	[Moscow TV]	29
Gorbachev, Ecuador's President Exchange Greetings	[TASS]	30

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Veteran Describes KGB as Untouched by Reforms	[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Jun]	31
Dispute Seen Over Freedom of Association Bill	[TASS]	34
Government Approves Joint-Stock Regulations	[Moscow TV]	34
Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress		35
Medvedev Chairs Draft Session	[PRAVDA 19 Jun]	35
Delegates Meet Central Committee	[PRAVDA 19 Jun]	36
Marxist Platform Group Meets	[PRAVDA 19 Jun]	37
Democratic Platform on Demands	[PRAVDA 18 Jun]	37
Co-op Council Nominates Delegates	[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]	38

Reconstituted Union Cannot Be 'Patchwork State' [PRAVDA 16 Jun]	38
Ligachev on Market Economy, Land Ownership [PRAVDA 18 Jun]	39
Primakov Answers Questions on Foreign Policy [PRAVDA 19 Jun]	43
Frolov Chairs PRAVDA Meeting With Literati [PRAVDA 16 Jun]	48
Girenko Speaks on Nationalities Issues [PRAVDA 19 Jun]	48
Miners' Congress Alarmed by Market Reform [TRUD 15 Jun]	48
Voluntary Contract Enlistment of MVD Troops [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Jun]	49
Support Seen for Volunteer, Locally Based Army [IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]	49
Combine Pays for Necessary Militia Unit [Moscow TV]	50
Air Force To Fly Chernobyl Children to Europe [PRAVDA 16 Jun]	50
Baptist Leader Klimenko Dies [TASS]	51
PROBLEMY MIRA Ceases Publication [PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA No 6]	51
'21st Century TV' To Be Set Up [Moscow Radio]	51
'First Commercial Radio Station' Opens in Moscow [Moscow Radio]	51
Comparison of CPSU Commission Discusses Policies	51

Economic

Leningrad Poll Shows Attitudes on Market [LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Jun]	52
Deputies Comment on Market Reform Program [PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK No 23]	53
Novosibirsk 'Council' Oversees Conversion Problems [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]	56
AUCCTU Calls for Economic Safeguards [TRUD 15 Jun]	56
Legal Basis for Regulated Market Needed [PRAVDA 7 Jun]	58
Mostovoy Views Changing Role of Gosstab [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Jun]	61
Plight of Paper Producers Detailed [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 13 Jun]	62
Gorbachev Message to Science, Industry Congress [PRAVDA 17 Jun]	63

Scientific

'Cosmos-2083' Satellite Launched 19 Jun [TASS]	64
New Unified Space Docking System Developed [TASS]	64
Officials Visit Novaya Zemlya Test Site [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 6 Jun]	64

Military

Officers Command New Air Support Bases [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jun]	65
Draft Concept of Military Reform Proposed [LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA]	66
KGB Border Guards' Chief Discusses State Border [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 May]	68

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Ryzhkov Awaiting Lithuanian Move on Proposal [Vilnius International]	70
Commission on Drawing Up Treaties Meets [Vilnius International]	70
Vilnius Radio Carries 20 June Supreme Council	70
Minorities Discussed	70
Rayon Decision Debated	71
Vilnius Rayon Council Decision Overturned [Vilnius International]	71
State Commission Formed [TASS]	71
Lithuania's Prunskiene Interviewed in Athens [IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]	71
Report From Lithuania on Problem of Deserters [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]	72
Report on Lithuanian Green Party Congress [Vilnius Radio]	72
Lithuanian Association of Homeless People Meets [TASS]	72
Proceedings at Estonian Party Congress Viewed [TASS]	73
Estonian Party Secretary Interviewed on Situation [Moscow Radio]	73
Estonian Communists Warn of Revival of Fascism [TASS]	73
Estonian Premier Holds Talks in Netherlands [Tallinn Radio]	74
Latvian Interior Minister Views Moscow Talks [Riga International]	74
Latvian Chief Supports Gorbachev More Than Party [AFP]	74

Deputies Question Gorbunov on Moscow Visit [Riga Radio]	75
Gorbunov Appeals to Latvian Minorities [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 12 May]	79
Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium Members Listed [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 12 May] ..	79
Latvian Interfront Appeals for Unity [SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 12 May]	80
Latvia Suspends Article of USSR Budget Law [TASS]	81
More on Riga Conference Discussing Party Renewal [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]	81

RSFSR

21 June Constituent Congress Session Previewed [TASS]	81
Party Congress Discusses Formation Principles [Moscow TV]	82
Spokesman on 'Rumors' of Gorbachev Resignation [TASS]	82
Gorbachev Urged To Remain Party Secretary [AFP]	82
20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists [Moscow TV]	83
Conference Renamed	83
Party Formation Viewed	83
Farming Policy Blamed	84
Ligachev Speaks	85
Deputies Demand Agenda	86
More on Party Formation	87
Party Name Discussed	87
Ligachev Addresses 20 June Constituent Congress [Moscow TV]	88
Says Leadership Losing 'Democratism' [TASS]	91
Comments on Future of Communism [Moscow International]	91
Ligachev Calls on Gorbachev To Step Down [AFP]	92
Makashov Addresses 19 June Russian Conference [Moscow TV]	92
Makashov Resignation Urged [IZVESTIYA 21 Jun]	93
Tyulkin Addresses 19 June Russian Conference [Moscow TV]	94
Kolganov Outlines Marxist Platform at Conference [Moscow TV]	96
Moscow Party Leader Assesses Conference [TASS]	99
Leader Interviewed [Moscow TV]	99
Communist Party Favored [TASS]	99
Leningrad Party Leader Addresses Conference [Moscow TV]	100
Ryzhkov Speaks on Party Renewal Process [TASS]	101
Conference Discusses Role of Russian Party [TASS]	102
TASS Reports on 20 June Russian Conference	102
Information Report Published on Party Conference [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jun]	103
TASS Reviews 21 June People's Deputy Session	103
Congress of People's Deputies Session Begins [Moscow TV]	104
Moscow TV Relays 20 June Congress Proceedings	104
Social Problems Viewed	104
Elections Viewed	104
Elections Continue	105
Candidates Address Congress	105
Decree on Authority Viewed	106
Debates Continue	106
More on Decree of Power	107
Amendments Debated	108
Deputies Congress Forms Supreme Soviet [TASS]	109
Yeltsin Criticized in Report From Congress [Moscow Radio]	109
Leningrad Committee Adopts Appeal for Lithuania [Vilnius Radio]	110

Western Republics

Ukraine Parliament Argues Over State Symbols [PRAVDA 22 May]	110
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Session Continues [PRAVDA 26 May]	111
Ukraine Supreme Soviet Session Discusses Issues [TASS]	111
Ukrainian Parliament Endorses Market Economy [Moscow Radio]	111
'Chernobyl' Union Congress Ends in Kiev [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Jun]	112
Dnepropetrovsk Prison Riot 'Under Control' [PRAVDA 19 Jun]	112
Ukraine's Ivashko Speaks at Party Congress [Kiev Radio]	112

Report on Ukrainian Communist Party Congress	[Kiev International]	113
Ukraine Congress Views Party Committee Report	[TASS]	114
'Stormy' Debates at Ukraine Communist Congress	[Moscow Radio]	115

Caucasus

Iran Earthquake Causes Tremors in Azerbaijan	[TASS]	115
Baku Reports on Incidents at Railway Stations	[Baku Radio]	115
Russian-Speaking Refugees Returning to Baku	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]	116
Turkish Religious Officials Visit Azerbaijan	[Baku Radio]	116
Armenian Presidium Views Aftermath of 27 May	[Yerevan Radio]	116
Armenian Presidium Announcement on Elections	[Yerevan Radio]	117
Georgia, Armenia Fail To Stop Draft-Dodging	[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]	117
Georgian Informals Propose Law on Parties	[ZARYA VOSTOKA 26 May]	118
Georgian Multiparty Elections Seen in Prospect	[TASS]	118
Georgia Soviet Proposes Sovereignty Commission	[Moscow TV]	119
Addenda, Draft Laws To Be Discussed	[Moscow Radio]	119

Central Asia

Uzbek 'Declaration of Sovereignty' Clarified	[TASS]	119
Premier Comments on Declaration	[Moscow TV]	119
Information Report on Uzbek Supreme Soviet	[Tashkent Radio]	120
Uzbeks Take First Steps Toward Economic Autonomy	[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]	120
Internal Affairs Ministry on Kirghizia Situation	[Moscow Radio]	121
End of Kirghiz Communist Party Congress Reported	[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]	121
Thousands Homeless After Kazakhstan Quake	[Moscow TV]	121

USSR Delegation Head Cited on CFE Talks

PM2006134590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 15 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Important Step Taken"]

[Text] Vienna, 14 Jun—Graphic evidence of how, with the presence of political will at the CFE talks, it is possible to resolve the most complex questions was provided by today's plenary session of that forum. The heads of the French and Polish delegations announced at it the accord reached in Vienna leading to the reduction of tanks and armored vehicles.

It provides for NATO and the Warsaw Pact having no more than 20,000 tanks each, and that number will include all tracked and wheeled tanks whose weight without fuel is 16.5 tons and more. Armored vehicles to be reduced include armored fighting vehicles which weigh less than 16.5 tons. They are subdivided into three groups: infantry fighting vehicles (IFV), armored personnel carriers (APC's), and armored vehicles with heavy weapons. It is planned that each alliance will be able to have no more than 30,000 of these vehicles, including no more than 18,000 IFV and no more than 1,500 armored vehicles with heavy weapons.

There is no doubt that an important step has been taken from both the military and political viewpoints. First, it is a case of two very dangerous and destabilizing categories of arms with which widespread ideas about the military threat and the armed forces' offensive potential are in many respects associated. Second, the protracted marking time in resolving questions of tanks and armored vehicles has markedly fettered progress at the Vienna talks and had an adverse effect on their progress. Some NATO countries tried for a long time to remove their light tanks from the restrictions. Now this difficulty has been overcome: the restrictions will encompass all types of armored fighting vehicles, including light tanks. It is thus now a question of completing the elaboration of definitions of tanks and armored vehicles.

The outcome which has been found, special envoy O.A. Grinevskiy, the head of the Soviet delegation, said in a talk with a TASS correspondent, means an important move forward. The path to it has not been simple, it was laid as the result of long and complex discussions and a balanced consideration of the concerns and interests of East and West. Important, if not determining, significance for finding a compromise attached to the talks held during the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington.

We agree with the scheme of the proposed solution and its package form, he continued. Figures are its main content. They are all acceptable to us. There is a mutual understanding which will create a solid and at the same time flexible basis, blazing a trail toward completing work in the very near future on the definitions of tanks and armored vehicles and embarking on a treaty formulation of the relevant clauses, he added.

'Complete Nuclear Test Ban' Said Possible

LD2006185990 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT
20 Jun 90

[Text] The two protocols signed by the Soviet and American presidents on June 1 in Washington, which deal with the 1974 and 1976 treaties on the limitation of nuclear tests, are politically very important. They pave the way to further steps at the Soviet-American stage-by-stage talks on the limitation and termination of nuclear tests. Igor Palyonykh, head of a Soviet delegation at the talks, said today at a briefing in the Soviet Foreign Ministry Press Center.

The control mechanism contained in the protocols can be used to create a system controlling further limitation and a complete nuclear test ban, he said.

According to the Soviet spokesman, the Soviet Union, which proposed resuming talks with the United States early next autumn, does not intend to confine itself to bilateral diplomacy in tackling the problem of stopping nuclear tests. The USSR is ready to "tackle it jointly with all other countries at multilateral forums". "At the same time, we, of course, are ready to take the most radical decision—a complete nuclear test ban, if the United States is ready to follow suit, or to announce a moratorium jointly with the American side," he continued.

Touching upon the 1974 treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests and the 1976 treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, Palyonykh said that the treaties, together with protocols, would soon be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet. "We expect the Supreme Soviet to begin their ratification as soon as it resumes its work," he said.

USSR Suggests Nuclear-Free Baltic Sea

PM2006154190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
21 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

["Own information" report: "Nuclear-Free Status for Baltic Sea"]

[Text] The USSR foreign minister has sent a letter to the foreign ministers of Bulgaria, Great Britain, Hungary, the GDR, Denmark, Norway, Poland, Romania, the United States, the FRG, France, Czechoslovakia, and Sweden on the question of imparting nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea.

The letter notes that the effective solution of the problem of nuclear-free status for the Baltic is possible only on the paths of multilateral talks with the Baltic states and with the nuclear powers which use the waters of the Baltic.

The aim of these talks could be the Baltic Sea's complete liberation from nuclear weapons of any type and the geographical zone of operation of the future accord on this question would extend over the sea's entire area, including territorial and internal waters and islands in

this water area, and also to the airspace above it and the seabed and the subsoil thereof.

The nuclear powers would undertake not to bring their ships with nuclear weapons on board into the Baltic Sea or to fly their aircraft with these weapons above it, and would also agree to the establishment of verification of the absence of nuclear weapons on board their ships entering the Baltic Sea or on it.

The coastal non-nuclear states of the Baltic Sea would undertake not to allow the appearance in the Baltic Sea of nuclear weapons belonging to other countries or to allow foreign warships with nuclear weapons on board within their territorial and internal waters, including in the form of calls at their ports.

Verification of compliance with the accord on the Baltic Sea's nuclear-free status would be implemented by national technical means; through cooperation between the states of the region and other signatories to the accord, including in the use of means for the long-distance detection of nuclear weapons on ships; through

the exchange of the information requested on a compulsory basis; through the implementation, when necessary, of on-site inspections on demand without the right of refusal; and also in other forms on which agreement could be reached.

The letter also says that the Soviet Union has unilaterally embarked on the elimination of certain categories of sea-launched nuclear weapons in the Baltic Sea water area. As a first step, the USSR has withdrawn four of the submarines known in the West as "Golf" submarines from the Baltic Fleet's effective strength and before the end of this year it will eliminate the two remaining ones. The ready inventory of nuclear missiles designed for these submarines is also being destroyed. The USSR has decided unilaterally to renounce the emplacement in peace time of nuclear weapons on Soviet ships and combat aircraft either permanently or temporarily inside the water area of the Baltic Sea and the air space above it and also not to emplace nuclear weapons on the seabed or in the subsoil thereof in the Baltic Sea inside its territorial and internal waters.

Gerasimov 20 June Briefing on World Issues

On Bulgaria, Burma Elections

LD2006150990 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Results of the elections in Bulgaria "realistically reflect the sovereign will of the Bulgarian people who voted for the continuation of democratic changes," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

The Bulgarian elections "were held on the whole in a normal atmosphere, without violations of basic rules of the democratic procedure," Gerasimov said.

This view is backed by the majority of foreign observers who had access to all polling stations, he added.

Gerasimov expressed the hope that the new Bulgarian parliament "will contribute to promoting equitable relations of goodneighbourhood" between the USSR and Bulgaria and between the peoples of the two countries that are "historically linked by traditions of mutual respect."

Assessing the preliminary results of the general elections to the People's Assembly of Myanmar (Burma), held on a multi-party basis and won by the National Democracy League, Gerasimov said:

"The Soviet Union respects the choice of the Myanmar people and expresses the hope that the democratic changes taking place in that country will facilitate the stability and further economic development of Myanmar and the invigoration of its foreign policy in the interests of peace and cooperation in Asia."

Praises Mitterrand Interview

LD2006152390 Moscow TASS in English 1457 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov today drew the attention of Soviet and foreign journalists to Francois Mitterrand's LE MONDE interview on Tuesday.

The French president expressed the hope that the European Economic Community and Western countries will consider "expanding financial, commercial and technological assistance to the USSR."

According to Mitterrand, France intends to advance specific proposals at the forthcoming West European summit in Dublin on June 25 and the meeting of the seven in Texas between July 9-11.

The French president said that he "believes in Gorbachev's success" despite the "immense complexity of the task" facing the Soviet leader.

In Mitterrand's view, this success is "in the interests of all", while failure would have "grave international consequences."

"We regard the French president's remarks as another vote of confidence by the West in our perestroika," Gerasimov said, praising Mitterrand as a veteran of the Western political corps with the reputation of a realistically minded politician.

On Ecological Problems in CSFR

LD2006164190 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Problems related to the ecological situation around Soviet military bases in Czechoslovakia have emerged, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He recalled that the Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia "is proceeding ahead of the schedule elaborated by the two sides".

The Soviet side, he said, was taking measures to clean up areas around garrisons vacated by the Soviet troops.

"As far as we know, Soviet and Czechoslovak experts do not agree on methods of assessing the ecological damage," Gerasimov said.

The command of the Central Group of Troops suggested establishing a joint Soviet-Czechoslovak commission to work out methods and criteria to evaluate the ecological damage in the areas around Soviet bases, he said.

On Plane Hijacked to Finland

LD2006163390 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Hope that the Finnish authorities will extradite Oleg Kozlov, who hijacked the Soviet Tu-134 airliner to Finland recently, was expressed by Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov at a briefing here today. He said criminal proceedings had been instituted against the hijacker in the Soviet Union.

The hijacking occurred on June 19 during the Tu-134 airliner's flight from Riga, Latvia's capital, to Murmansk in the northwest of Russia. Oleg Kozlov, born in 1970, threatened to blow up the aircraft brandishing a fake hand grenade. He gave himself up to the Finnish authorities and applied for asylum.

The airliner, Gerasimov said, left Helsinki yesterday to complete its flight to Murmansk. All the passengers, including three children, are safe and sound.

The Finnish side were very attentive to the Soviet passengers, who found themselves in Helsinki against their will. They were given a chance to rest before continuing the flight. Medical aid was offered but, fortunately, was not required.

We are grateful to the Finnish authorities for the hospitality and the prompt return of the airliner, the Soviet spokesman said.

At the same time, Gerasimov recalled that between the Soviet Union and Finland there is a cooperative agreement to suppress airliner hijacking, signed in 1974. Under Point One of Article Three of that agreement, the sides assumed the obligation to take urgent measures to extradite persons guilty of hijacking.

"The Soviet side has addressed a relevant request to Finland," Gerasimov said. "The Finnish side is now examining the circumstances".

London Poles Rehabilitated

*LD2006172790 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT
20 Jun 90*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet Court ruled on April 19, 1990 on the rehabilitation of former commander of the Armia Krajowa Leopold Okulicki, deputy prime minister of the Polish emigrant government in London Jan-Stanislaw Jankowski and other members of the Polish underground parliament and government, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

He said criminal proceedings were terminated concerning thirteen people, declared not guilty as their actions lacked corpus delicti.

Also exonerated were Adam Benia, Stanislaw Jasukowicz, Kazimir Purzak, Aleksander Zwerzinski, Kazimir Baginski, Eugeniusz Czarnowsky, Stanislaw Merzwa, Zbigniew Stypulkowski, Josef Chacinski, Franz Urbanski and Anton Paidak.

Officials at the USSR Chief Military Procuracy had to pore over 36 volumes of investigation records before ruling on the matter, Gerasimov said. The great volume of work was the reason for the delayed reply to the appeal from Poland's procurator-general of November 14 last, he added.

On Central American Peace Process

*LD2006192890 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT
20 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—"The Soviet Union and other members of the world community are ready to exert the necessary effort to strengthen the peace process in Central America," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Commenting on the recent meeting of the Central American presidents in Guatemala, Gerasimov said that it focused on ways to revive the economic development of the countries in the region.

The presidents analysed the political aspects of the Central American settlement.

Gerasimov said that the Central American presidents positively assessed the results of their talks, and added that the Soviet Union agreed in principle with those assessments.

On Group of 15 Appeal to Presidents

*LD2006193490 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT
20 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The non-aligned and developing countries increasingly understand the usefulness of the Soviet-American dialogue, not only for the Soviet Union and the United States but for the whole world, said Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov at a news conference here today.

He was commenting on the joint appeal of the leaders of the so-called Group of Fifteen to the Soviet and American presidents. The first session of the leaders of fifteen non-aligned and developing countries was held in Kuala Lumpur in early June this year to discuss the Third World's economic development strategy during global changes, as well as strengthening South-South cooperation and the resumption of South-North dialogue.

The heads of states and governments, who assembled in the Malaysian capital, appealed to Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush during their concurrent Washington summit. The message expresses hope that the Soviet-U.S. dialogue in Washington will mark a new era in international relations, when trust and cooperation will become the norm and progress a common aim shared by all.

The Soviet spokesman expressed satisfaction with the 'fifteen countries' growing understanding of the usefulness of the Soviet-American dialogue, including for the countries of the extensive Third World. He stressed that the interests and aspirations of the non-aligned and developing countries are invariably taken into account by the Soviet Union in its international contacts.

'Diverse Problems' Discussed at CSCE Conference

*PM2006135990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4*

[Report by special correspondent A. Lopukhin on the second meeting of the CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension, under the general heading "On the Spot": "Both Diplomats and the Public"]

[Text] Copenhagen—In recent days the delegations which have assembled in the Danish capital have not been holding plenary sittings open to the public; work on the concluding documents is going on. Nevertheless the debates carried on by various nongovernmental organizations within the framework of a program of parallel events continue unabated.

The most diverse problems are being raised: after all, the term "the human dimension," which has recently come into all-European use, embraces the whole enormous spectrum of human rights. For example, there have been hearings on the freedom of speech, on prohibitions on professions in the FRG and displays of anti-Semitism in the USSR, on the position of refugees and women's rights....

Representatives of Soviet social organizations are actively participating in the debates. The time has passed when in the main the Soviet side had to defend itself at international forums on human rights. This, I think, is a result of the processes of democratization which are evolving in our country.

The following question is increasingly frequently voiced in Copenhagen in debates within the framework of the parallel events: just how are they going to be held in Moscow, where the third meeting of the CSCE Conference on the Human Dimension will be held in fall next year? "Preparations for holding the Moscow forum's parallel events have actually already begun," V. Tereshkova, chairman of the presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and its Helsinki commission, said. "It is important to bear in mind the experience of these days' work in Copenhagen, so that the most diverse nongovernmental organizations will be able to play an even more active part in the Moscow sitting."

...People's diplomacy is a never-ending source of new ideas and unorthodox approaches in international affairs. Combined with the experience and knowledge of professionals, this will help to guarantee the building of the all-European home in which the peoples' will will be directly embodied in everyday reality.

United States & Canada

Aleksey Obukhov Meets CIA's John Helgerson

LD2006173290 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT
20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksey Obukhov today received John Helgerson, deputy director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency [title as received], at his request.

The two examined a broad range of issues of mutual interest, related to Soviet-American relations.

Radio Discusses Future, Budget of CIA

LD2006101990 Moscow in English to North America
2300 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The administration's proposal for a \$30 billion allocation to be made in 1991 for covert operations by the CIA and other intelligence departments is under scrutiny by United States Congress. Commentary is by Vladislav Kozyakov.

United States taxpayers may well be interested to know how the money is going to be spent. While the cold war was under way, there was always a way of explaining huge spendings by the need to counter the Soviet Union and its allies, seen as America's main enemies. With the changes, in the Soviet Union, East Europe and elsewhere, and increasing confidence building between the superpowers and the shift away from rivalry to cooperation and partnership, a steady increase in CIA's budget from last year's \$25 billion to 28 billion this year and \$30 billion in 1991 gives rise to many questions.

In anticipation of such questions from Congress and taxpayers, CIA officials in a string of interviews speak of great debates underway about the agency's future, and of more progress to be made in future on combatting drug trafficking and terrorism. But by all accounts the agency's main line of cold war years (?in that) confrontation with the East is still prevailing. United States legislators may have been surprised that the CIA officials at congressional hearings into the agency's budget tried to prove the need for spying in East Europe. One legislator asked the official whether the agency was spying on Walesa in Poland or Havel in Czechoslovakia. [passage omitted]

Following reports of the proposed CIA spending, the question arising for the Soviet Union is one of confidence building and cooperation between the two countries. Do United States departments operating in the shady world of cloak and dagger really set any store by it?

U.S. NEWS Claims on Gorbachev Talks Refuted

LD2006204590 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1311 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS political observer Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow, 20 June (TASS)—A curious report was carried by the journal U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT in its issue of 24 June. Quoting certain "ambassadors of leading Western countries in Washington" it published the contents of diplomatic despatches they had been "sent to their Ministries of Foreign Affairs." And the ambassadors were reporting nothing more nor less than the content of "private talks" between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush which took place during the recent summit meeting in Washington.

In particular, the journal asserts, during these conversations "the Soviet leader recognized the necessity of returning to Japan" the Kuril Islands which belong to the Soviet Union. He also allegedly promised "that the Kremlin will step up pressure on the ruling dynasty in North Korea" in order to soften its tough policies. And in general the Soviet side, which had chosen the United States as the location for the meeting with the president of South Korea, allegedly expressed the hope that "the Soviet Government will be able to coordinate its policy in this region with Washington." Well, in exchange there would be "expected rewards for Moscow: major investment agreements with the Japanese and the South Koreans."

That is the kind of "discovery" that has apparently been made by this important U.S. journal, which described it as "serious, and not yet made public."

One can but wonder at the "inventiveness" of the authors of this particular note which was compiled according to the worst traditions of the gutter press. I have grounds for stating that nothing resembling what was reported by the journal took place during the private conversations between the leaders of the USSR and the United States. This did not take place, if only for the reason that it was simply impossible for it to do so.

I do not know what the ambassadors of the Western countries told the journal, but this is what Marlin Fitzwater, the White House press secretary, said at a briefing there on 5 June:

"What did the President (of the United States) say to Gorbachev about the northern territories," the press secretary was asked.

"We simply pointed out that we support the long-standing request by Japan that these islands should be returned to that country," he replied.

"And what was the reaction of the Soviet side?"

"The same reaction as always: What they are not willing to do that."

I do not know whether anyone from the staff of the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT was at that briefing, but it seems to me that the press secretary's answer was perfectly clear.

The journal's assertions about "Moscow's promised pressure" on the Korean People's Democratic Republic

sound like even bigger nonsense. Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting in San Francisco with No Tae-u was held not with the objective of reaching some kind of deal: Political relations in exchange for loans and goods. As far as I know what was under discussion there, at least from the Soviet side's point of view, was how to promote the development of dialogue between the North and the South and the peaceful reunification of Korea, which would lead directly to a lowering of tension on the Korean peninsula and to the strengthening of peace and stability in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region. And this discussion was conducted in the spirit of the well-known Soviet position on the Korean problem and in the context of the well-known Soviet initiatives put forward in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk—initiatives, moreover, which have not yet received a proper reply from the United States. What "policy coordination" and indeed what "expected rewards" are there to speak of here?

That is the essence of the matter, which, no matter what the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT may assert to the contrary, was long ago made public. Let those who have ears hear, runs the saying. But perhaps there are some people who aren't particularly keen to hear the truth?

Young U.S. Leaders To Visit 18-30 Jun

PM2006092790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Sukhoy dispatch: "Off to Youth Leaders' Meeting"]

[Text] New York, 15 Jun—A delegation of 200 Americans is setting off for the Soviet Union. Young politicians, businessmen, military specialists, scientists, and cultural figures will take part in the 18-30 June second meeting of U.S. and USSR youth leaders.

After their arrival in Moscow the Americans will be divided into 17 working commissions and depart for various cities in the USSR.

"This is the first U.S. delegation of its kind to visit the USSR," Steven Hayes, president of the American International Leaders' Center—the organization sponsoring the meeting—told us. "I mean above all that it comprises people from a great variety of professions—from congressmen's aides to foresters and preachers."

Gorbachev Message Read to Young Californians

PM2006151590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Presidents Appealed to Them"]

[Text] Ten U.S. schoolchildren from Viewpoint School in the Los Angeles suburbs have arrived in Moscow.

This is a return visit. In January the Soviet Peace Foundation sent a group of children from Moscow's No. 39 School to California at the Viewpoint School's invitation. This seemingly local event caused a widespread reaction in America. It was closely covered by the press, and the Soviet and U.S. schoolchildren were sent a message by U.S. President George Bush. He expressed confidence that the exchange would be a wonderful opportunity for the two countries' youngsters to get to know each other better.

On 19 June the U.S. children and their Muscovite contemporaries assembled at the Soviet Peace Foundation Board. In a ceremonial atmosphere Anatoliy Karpov, chairman of the foundation board, read out the text of a message from USSR President M.S. Gorbachev cordially welcoming the students from California. "Your visit is yet another good sign of change and a reaffirmation of the fruitfulness of exchanges between our countries," the greeting said. "I see this as a wonderful opportunity for open communication, and for people to get to know each other better and—through close human contact—to gain a better knowledge of the country."

"During my recent visit to the United States I had many meetings with Americans, not least in your state of California. And I experienced sincere sympathy for us, the friendship shown by Americans, and their desire for good relations with the Soviet Union."

"I have no doubt that you will experience similar feelings about the United States and a closeness of hopes and aspirations on the part of Soviet people—and of your contemporaries above all."

"I hope that your stay will be interesting, that you will make real friends, and take many impressions away with you. The bridge of friendship which you are building together with our young boys and girls is a bridge to a new era in world history where mutual understanding and cooperation will reign." On behalf of himself and Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva the president wished the U.S. schoolchildren "bon voyage in life."

China

PRC Vice Premier on Reunification With Taiwan

*PM2006104190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3*

[TASS report: "No Reasons To Be Divided"]

[Text] Beijing, 17 Jun—"The great Chinese nation, which has behind it a history of 5,000 years of civilization, has no reasons to be divided.

"On the basis of the principle of China's unity we must sit down at the conference table, discussing all questions of the country's reunification." This was stated by Wu Xueqian, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and vice premier of the PRC State Council, at a meeting with a Taiwanese delegation.

The Chinese leader, RENMIN RIBAO writes today, confirmed that the PRC will continue to follow the principle of the country's peaceful reunification on the basis of the "one state-two systems" concept, which will remain unchanged in the future.

The reports which have appeared in the Western press recently to the effect that "the PRC intends to recreate the Fuzhao military district" (Fuzhao is the administrative center of the Eastern province of Fujian, situated opposite Taiwan island), he continued, are absolutely unfounded. The course toward peaceful reunification remains unchanged.

PRC's Jiang Zemin on Durability of Socialism

*PM1906133790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 First Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Endurance Test: Jiang Zemin on Events in Eastern Europe"]

[Text] Beijing, 18 Jun—Neither last year's disorders in China nor the dramatic changes in the East European countries can alter our course of reforms and the pursuit of a policy of openness toward the outside world.

On the contrary, those events galvanize us even more to ensure the successful embodiment of this policy in life. That was stated by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, in a letter replying to a group of U.S. students and published by XINHUA today.

The events in the East European countries, Jiang Zemin noted, are evidence merely of a delay in socialism's development. This should certainly not lead to the conclusion that it has been defeated or has collapsed. "Socialism is a viable system capable of passing this endurance test," the general secretary of the CPC Central Committee stressed. China, he noted, chose the socialist path not from external reasons but in the light of its national conditions and needs. The Chinese people's wish is not to change the social system but to seek, through reforms, the path to the further consolidation and improvement of developed socialism in China. They

want to go further along the path of economic and social progress, improve their material prosperity, and enrich their cultural life.

PRC Minister Details Anticrime Campaign

*PM2006142190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3*

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "Operation 'No to Crime!'"]

[Text] China's minister of public security, Wang Fang, has stated that the government intends to begin a campaign to deliver a resolute blow against dangerous crime, which has increased markedly in the past few months.

He did not cite specific figures but noted that public order in some regions obviously leaves room for improvement. Murders and robberies are particularly worrying. The minister also drew attention to the growth of organized gangs, which operate freely in some rural regions. In structure they are reminiscent of the secret societies of old China.

Robbers on railroads and those who encroach on public property will also come within the police's purview.

Wang Fang, in describing the forthcoming campaign, did not name the specific measures which will be used in suppressing crime but noted that in terms of their dimensions they will be reminiscent of the 1983 campaign began on the personal instructions of Deng Xiaoping. The feature of that campaign was that in several cities the police, prosecutor's office, and judges collaborated actively on the principle that "the sooner sentence is passed the better."

Observers note that all regions and organizations where the crime level is particularly high will be set time limits within which they must resolve problems of law and order.

A large number of foreign tourists is expected in Beijing during the Asian Games—the main event of the year—before which less than 100 days remain. It is perfectly obvious that ensuring the maximum safety for people at this time in Beijing and other cities is one of the main aims of the "No to crime!" operation.

Agricultural Venture With PRC in Belorussia

*PM1906155590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6*

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent M. Shimanskiy: "Chinese in Our Fields"]

[Text] Minsk—Yes, Chinese have started working in the Belorussian fields. The "Manusonik-guta" Soviet-Chinese joint venture has been set up in Pruzhenskiy Rayon. A team of 15 Chinese agricultural workers has leased 40 hectares of recultivated peat bog.

They are growing vegetables as well as soybeans and melons. The Chinese have amazed the local people with their industry. The soybean seeds were sown by hand—10 people sowed nearly four hectares in four hours. Why by hand? They decided not to take any risks—it is safer that way. They have promised to obtain a harvest of at least 20 quintals of soybeans per hectare—very high by our standards. According to the contract, a considerable proportion of the agricultural products grown by the Chinese team will remain in the hands of the rayon agro-industrial association.

Northeast Asia

DPRK Nuclear Secrecy Gives Seoul Ideas

PM2006153190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 90 p 3

[M. Petrov article: "The Bomb: The Korean Version?"]

[Text] The mass media often carry concerned reports on how various countries are conducting work with military applications in the nuclear energy sphere. As is well known, work of this kind presupposes a fairly high level of development of the industrial base, requires great material expenditure, and often cannot manage without outside help in one form or another. Pakistan, Israel, or Iraq usually feature in these reports. But are they the only ones?

The journal ASIA WEEK, which follows this subject closely, reports that as early as 1985 the American government announced that it had intelligence information at its disposal on the establishment of a secret nuclear reactor in the DPRK. It claimed that a nuclear reactor which had not been registered with the IAEA was being built 90 km from Pyongyang, in the small town of Yongbyon. In July last year THE WASHINGTON POST reported that plutonium was being extracted from nuclear fuel at Yongbyon. In September 1989 the London journal JANE'S DEFENSE WEEKLY claimed that the DPRK "will be able to produce combat nuclear devices within five years and the delivery facilities for them soon after."

In the past, these deductions have been based on alleged satellite photographs and on the correlation of data: the existence of large uranium and graphite reserves in the DPRK, for example. Moreover, attention has been drawn to the fact that the DPRK has highly trained specialists, who the Soviet Union and China have been training for the last 20 years. In February this year, however, this was supplemented by photographs taken from a French artificial satellite. This photographic material has been underpinned by the results of a computer analysis conducted by Japanese Professor Sakata Toshibumi.

The situation surrounding Yongbyon could have been resolved by an international on-site inspection. Especially as, according to the journal ASIA WEEK, the

DPRK's Central Information Agency has confirmed the existence of a reactor in this region that is not registered with the IAEA. However, the Korean side rejects all these suspicions, claiming that the reactor at Yongbyon is for research purposes.

In 1977 the DPRK concluded an agreement with the IAEA which authorized the inspection of the two nuclear reactors built with Soviet assistance, and, in 1985, became signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. As is well known, a signature to this treaty provides for drawing up within 19 [figure as published] months an appropriate document with the IAEA on monitoring all existing nuclear installations. However, ASIA WEEK claims, "Pyongyang is still working on this agreement and has not yet notified the IAEA of the reactor at Yongbyon." According to the same journal, the DPRK is dragging out talks with the IAEA, making the signing of a multilateral agreement on the Korean peninsula's nuclear-free status a preliminary condition.

It is not hard to try to understand the Korean position in this matter, particularly if you consider the existence of a considerable quantity of American nuclear weapons in the southern part of the peninsula. At the same time, it is impossible not to foresee that creating a veil of secrecy around Yongbyon could give rise to suspicion in South Korea and serve as a pretext for galvanizing South Korea's nuclear energy program.

Preparations for Mongolian Election Assessed

PM2006141990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Viktor Sapov report: "Who Is To Be in the Hural?"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 15 Jun—The elections of deputies to the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] People's Great Hural scheduled for 29 July have increased the political activeness of all strata of the population. And this is understandable. For the first time they will take place in conditions of a multiparty system and democratic guarantees. The appropriate legal basis has been created at the last two People's Great Hural sessions: Amendments have been made to the constitution, a renewed law on the election of people's deputies has been ratified, and a new law on political parties adopted.

Only people who are not members of the Council of Ministers or the Supreme Court can be the deputies of the People's Great Hural—the highest organ of state power—for a five-year term. The whole intention of the elections is to renew society's political system. In other words, the state is to be its nucleus, rather than the MPRP [Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party], which has given up its monopoly on power. As a result of this, in addition to the People's Great Hural, a permanently operating top legislative organ—the Lesser Hural—will appear. This will consist of 50 members plus

a chairman, deputy chairman, and secretary—all these will be elected from the members of the People's Great Hural.

Today 430 electoral districts have been created in the country for the nomination of candidates, and these are in turn broken down into precincts. A Central Territorial Commission which includes representatives of the new political forces has been formed. Local commissions are also being set up on the same basis.

The Central Territorial Commission's first sessions highlighted a substantial difference in approaches. For instance, the law on elections stipulates the election of one People's Great Hural deputy per administrative-territorial unit of local significance. This is dictated by the specific nature of rural areas, to be more precise, by the sparse population of the countryside and by the far-flung nature of the sumas [local administrative divisions]. But in large population centers on the republic-wide scale the districts will consist of 10,000 voters. However, the new political forces regard this as "an injustice and a violation of democratic election norms."

Another cause of dissatisfaction is the fact that the election campaign began before the new political parties were officially registered, and they naturally did not have time to set up their primary organizations at local level. The clear imperfection of the law on the election of people's deputies is also not to the credit of the official authorities. Specific proposals on this matter are contained in the recent statement by the "democrats" in the People's Great Hural.

The abundant polarity of opinions is making itself felt increasingly keenly in practice. After the formation of the Coalition of Democratic Forces, the Revolutionary Youth League, the Mongolian unions of women, veterans, agricultural associations, and stockraisers and farmers, the committee of war participants, and the Patriotic Unity Front declared their support for the MPRP. At a recent rally of the Coalition of Democratic Forces notes of discontent with this consolidation of forces were heard: If the need arises, it was said, the opposition will not take part in the elections at all. At the same time, the democrats are being more active than the MPRP. And it is time that the MPRP brought its activists out of the trenches, many believe.

Meanwhile, success in the cause lies in holding an active position. The MPRP's election manifesto and the appeal by G. Ochirbat, chairman of the MPRP Central Committee, directing party organizations and party members to approach the preparations for the elections more flexibly are consonant with this.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Cambodian Cease-Fire, Khmer Rouge Role Viewed

BK2006123790 Moscow in *Cambodian to Cambodia*
1100 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Oleg Alekseyev commentary]

[Text] How can the war in Cambodia end? In analyzing relevant commentaries run by newspapers, radios, and television networks in Southeast Asian countries, the issue, at this point in time, is a common concern for the political milieus and the large segments of public opinion in those countries. In this connection, our observer, comrade Oleg Alekseyev, writes as follows:

The question of ending the civil war in Cambodia has long been a topic of discussion for Southeast Asian broadcasting services. Since the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia in the third quarter of 1989, Cambodian opposition groups have launched large-scale military operations against the Phnom Penh government. Now, this question is becoming more important, in view of the 4-5 June Tokyo meeting where the leader of the opposition group, Samdech Sihanouk, and Son Sann, leader of a moderate party, agreed in principle with Hun Sen, the head of the Phnom Penh government, on the need to implement a cease-fire in Cambodia. The consent was specified in a joint communique.

The only faction refusing to sign the document was the Khmer Rouge, which is the largest and most war-mongering group of the contending alliance. In this respect, the Indonesian newspaper MERDEKA asked what method could be used to bring the Cambodian war to a halt? In effect, this was to question what measures should be taken to force the Khmer Rouge to join the position adopted by their allies in the opposition. By all appearances, according to MERDEKA as well as other broadcasting services in Southeast Asia, a decisive answer can be given by the states involved in the problem. As a matter of fact, the question of restoring peace to Cambodia was raised in recent talks in Washington between U.S. President George Bush and Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan. At a press briefing, Assistant Secretary for East Asia and Pacific Affairs Richard Solomon said Chatchai Chunhawan called on U.S. President George Bush to push for the cessation of military aid to the Khmer Rouge. The same appeal was also addressed by the Thai prime minister to the Japanese Government.

The ongoing shipment of armaments, which enables the Khmer Rouge to continue their military operations, is the most complicated issue for the time being. If the issue can be resolved, meaning if the military aid to the Khmer Rouge ceases, the latter will have no way to prolong the war. Moreover, the cease-fire will eventually provide the possibility of materializing a number of measures to establish new power structures in Cambodia based on a national reconciliation principle, concluded our observer, comrade Oleg Alekseyev.

Release of Burma's Suu Kyi, Tin U Urged

BK1706095690 Moscow in *Burmese to Burma*
1430 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Commentary by station observer Aleksandr Vladimirov]

[Text] Dear listeners, the most pressing question for all the people in Myanmar [Burma] who voted in favor of the National League for Democracy [NLD] led by Daw Aung San Suu Kyi is when will she be freed from house arrest. Our observer has this to say:

It is the personality of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi that attracted the Burmese people to vote for the NLD. Foreign journalists who were permitted to cover the elections in Myanmar comment that the people who came to the polling booths to cast their votes on 27 May did not seem to have taken much time to study the policies of the 93 parties participating in the elections. These journalists say they simply voted for Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's party because she was the most spirited in opposing and denouncing the policies of the military government.

It is of course true that the elections were fair and honest as promised by the Senior General Saw Maung government. But, although it is difficult to gauge that what they say is true, the Myanmar people say that the elections were free because the ruling State Law and Order Restoration Council believed that the National Unity Party it supports would win or that the election outcome would be so inconclusive that it would favor the military to continue its hold on power.

Opposition forces and their representatives express their beliefs that the release of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and another detained NLD leader, U Tin U, is the only way for the government to show it has full confidence in the people and that it would not try to ignore the people's wishes. The importance of releasing Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and U Tin U is not due to that point alone.

In the future, when the NLD becomes the ruling party, it will have to pass through a difficult phase in drafting and establishing its political tactics and strategy. In addition, it is also essential for the NLD to hold talks with the State Law and Order Restoration Council for the convening of the new parliament made up of entirely new People's Assembly candidates.

It will also be essential to form a new government in the near future. The drafting and passing of a new democratic constitution for Myanmar is also expected to be a difficult and complicated process. At the same time, those who are active in the NLD leadership are not all of one mind. In the same way as there are people who prefer the middle of the road approach, there are also radicals who want fundamental changes.

Although the NLD does get enthusiastic support, there are student leaders who are concerned about the involvement of people within the NLD who have past military connections, and they see many problems ahead. Talks would also not be easy with organizations and parties belonging to ethnic nationals who are demanding that the new state constitution guarantee nationalities' rights.

Today, there is only one person who can unify all the parties concerned, and that is the daughter of General Aung San [Aung San Suu Kyi].

From the results of the elections it is obvious that quite a number of soldiers also voted for the NLD. This, we believe, is a good omen because it points to the possibility of normalizing in the near future of the relations between the Defense Services and the new leadership of Myanmar. Our observer Aleksandr Vladimirov says the military leadership would be indicating their readiness to make use of such an opportunity if it were to release the NLD leaders now.

Burma's Military Reluctant To Transfer Power

BK2006152990 Moscow in Burmese to Burma
1030 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "The Military Regime 's Dragging Its Feet'"]

[Text] According to news reports from Yangon [Rangoon], Senior General Saw Maung, leader of the State Law and Order Restoration Council, has quashed the prospects of a quick change to civilian rule. What Senior General Saw Maung meant [in his recent speech] was that the transfer of power may come about only after the drafting a state constitution which is perfect in all respects without any shortcomings and weaknesses that may give rise new political problems in the future. By the looks of it, the authorities in Myanmar [Burma] want to make this the main political issue in the country today.

Foreign observers have persistently been saying that the drafting and the passing of the state constitution would take quite some time if the complexities and difficulties regarding the socioeconomic, political, and racial problems that face Myanmar are to be taken into account. The military regime intends to keep a firm grip on state power while the drafting process is going on.

But, the leadership of the National League for Democracy [NLD], which won the (?recently concluded) elections, has issued a statement. According to that statement, the NLD headquarters believes the passage of the state constitution can be made possible within relatively a short time so that the process of transferring state power can be speeded up.

As a response to the military regime's declaration, NLD Central Executive Committee member U Kyi Maung once said it was possible to prepare a new constitution on the basis of the state constitution of 1947.

But bent on giving no leeway, Senior General Saw Maung has now come out to say that the 1947 constitution is incomplete and that it had been the source of racial problems.

By emphasizing on a problem associated with the constitution, the authorities want to down play the importance of releasing Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the leader of the NLD which won the 27 May elections. So far,

nothing black or white has been legally said about the future of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi who celebrated her 45th birthday under house arrest. She has been placed under house arrest under the 1975 law which protects the state from being endangered.

Many political leaders believe that it is vital for all political forces in the country to join hands to bring about the successful convening of the Myanmar Parliament and the quick drafting of a new state constitution. And for that to happen, they point out that it is essential for Daw Aung San Suu Kyi to take part in the endeavors.

Foreign observers feel that the NLD leader is still in the hands of people who are reluctant to hand over power quickly to a democratically elected government and new Parliament.

But observers who are careful in making observations do notice what Senior General Saw Maung said; that there is no opposition in Myanmar but only insurgents. Military authorities have also been saying that they will not permit the recurrence of events similar to those in 1988. This may be a direct warning to the radical elements within the NLD.

Major news agencies have been saying that such statements by the authorities are proof that the military does not intend to quickly make way for the new government following the multiparty elections as had been promised earlier.

The All-Burma Patriotic Youth Organization and the All Burma Federation of Students Unions have meanwhile been demanding the release of the NLD leader. The support for the NLD has been far and wide and has even crossed Myanmar's borders. World nations have officially been calling for the further deepening of the democratic process in Myanmar.

Near East & South Asia

Conflict Among Afghan Rebel Groups Increasing

LD2006063690 Moscow TASS in English 0625 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Semenenko]

[Text] Islamabad June 20 TASS—Divisions in the ranks of the Pakistan-based Afghan armed opposition continue to deepen with every passing day.

According to the DAWN newspaper, field commanders controlled by Gulbuddin Hekmatyar's Islamic Party of Afghanistan decided at a meeting in Peshawar to block efforts of the so-called "transitional government" to organize elections to a Loya Jerga [Grand Assembly] in opposition-controlled regions of the country.

In this connection, leaders of the "transitional governments" were warned against sending representatives to Afghanistan. If the "government" emissaries appear on Afghan territory their activity will meet resistance from

the Islamic Party of Afghanistan and they may even be arrested, according to a message sent to the "president of the transitional government" Sibghatullah Mojaddedi.

The participants in the meeting also demanded Mojaddedi's immediate resignation.

Hekmatyar, who previously held the post of "minister of foreign affairs", withdrew from the "transitional government" along with his supporters early this year, accusing it of incompetence and inability to solve the Afghan problem. The leader of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan insists on dissolving the "government" and says that its term of office expired back in February. Hekmatyar said he disagreed with the election formula to the Loya Jerga proposed by the "transitional government".

Hekmatyar's actions have led to a split in the notorious "seven-party alliance", based in Peshawar. According to Pakistani news analysts, friction between the leaders of the Afghan armed opposition was caused by a fierce struggle for spheres of influence in mujahidin-controlled areas of Afghanistan.

According to reports reaching here from Peshawar, the open war which broke out last July between Hekmatyar's group and the Islamic Society of Afghanistan, controlled by Burhanuddin Rabbani, is continuing to this day. There are also occasional armed clashes between detachments of other mujahidin parties.

USSR To Abide by UN Zionism Resolution

JN2106100390 Amman AL-RA'Y in Arabic 21 Jun 90 p 26

[By 'Awdah 'Awdah]

[Text] USSR Ambassador in Amman Yuriy Gryadunov has made an exclusive statement to AL-RA'Y in which he said that the USSR is opposed to canceling the 1975 UN resolution linking Zionism with racism.

The ambassador said the USSR was instrumental in issuing this resolution at the time and will not retreat from it now because there is not a single reason for retreating from or canceling the resolution.

The ambassador denounced Israel's inhuman practices against the Palestinian inhabitants in the occupied territories such as repression, detention, deportation, the use of poison gas, the closure of schools and colleges, and the demolition of houses.

The ambassador rejected rumors that the USSR might abandon its Arab friends and said: we are still friends and we are proud of this friendship. This has been reiterated by many Soviet leaders, including President Gorbachev. The ambassador added: the Soviet Union has always demanded Israel's withdrawal from the territories occupied in 1967 and reaching a settlement to solve the Palestinian people and support the Palestinian people's legitimate rights to self-determination and establish the independent Palestinian state.

Gryadunov denied that there is any Soviet retreat from this principled position, affirming the unceasing USSR calls on the U.S. leaders to stop their support of Israel and to back the Palestinian people's just cause.

On possible USSR measures, if the Israeli rulers insist on settling the Soviet Jewish immigrants in the occupied territory, the ambassador said: I cannot but repeat the words that Gorbachev has always reiterated in connection with Jewish emigration—namely, that the USSR will reconsider its position if Israel insists on settling the immigrants in the occupied territory.

The ambassador, however, did not reveal such future measures.

The ambassador denied reports that a Soviet troupe has visited the occupied Arab territories and entertained Israeli soldiers and said this report is untrue.

Patsev Appointed New Ambassador to Oman

LD1606043390 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1745 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—As was reported here today, Aleksandr Patsev has been appointed USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Sultanate of Oman.

Aleksandr Patsev was born in 1936 and is a Russian. In 1959 he graduated from the Moscow State Historical Archives Institute and in 1969 from the Diplomatic Academy of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

He has been in diplomatic service since 1969. [passage omitted]

Sub-Saharan Africa

Ethiopian Rebels Reject Government Peace Plan

EA2006095490 Moscow International Service
in Amharic 1530 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Africa as we see it" program]

[Text] The Eritrean People's Liberation Front, [EPLF], has refused to hold talks with the Ethiopian Government on seeking peaceful solutions to the problems. The front has asked for a United Nations supervised referendum to determine the future of Eritrea. Here is a commentary on the issue by Maksim Yevgenyev.

The statement issued by the Ethiopian State Council on 14 June 1990 noted that the secessionists, by refusing to take part in the peace talks, had revealed their anti-people stance. The refusal of the EPLF to take part in the peace talks was revealed to the Ethiopian Government by the former U.S. President Jimmy Carter, who participated in last year's peace talks together with Julius Nyerere. This decision was taken by the EPLF at a time when Jimmy Carter and Julius Nyerere were in consultation to determine the venue and date for resuming the

talks, soon after the Ethiopian Government had made new moves in a bid to bring about peace in the country. The new peace proposals published last week by the Ethiopian Government had given hope that the peace process would continue in that subregion.

According to political observers, the Ethiopian Government has shown its commitment to peace by putting forward these new proposals to reach an agreement with the opposition forces. For instance, the government has (?invited) U.N. observers to take part in the forthcoming talks, and has allowed Mitsiwa port to be used for the passage of relief food to alleviate the plight of the famine-stricken people in northern Ethiopia. Some observers say that the EPLF had earlier asked repeatedly for these two issues to be tackled and hence, the Ethiopian Government has taken a bold step to come closer to opposition forces. In my view, says Maksim Yevgenyev, this Ethiopian Government step comes as a follow-up to the peace initiative put forward a year ago at the Ethiopian National Shengo's emergency session.

It should be recalled that the Ethiopian Government had called for peace talks to be started without any preconditions, in a bid to bring about peace. It is a pity that the peace process, which began promptly, did not bear fruit. We think the reason for the failure of the talks could be that the long-standing mistrust of the concerned parties, and the desire of each party to gain the upper hand militarily has not yet been fully eliminated. While the two parties have been unable to achieve military superiority the entire masses of Ethiopia have been suffering most.

Inasmuch as the EPLF's decision indicates that it does not want to rectify the situation, the EPLF should be responsible for the suffering of the people and the country, the Ethiopian State Council said in its statement. The leaders of the front should realize that by refusing not to take part in the peace talks, they are losing popularity in Africa and the world at large. On the one hand, the idea of secession is not acceptable in most African countries, and on the other the international community is greatly concerned about the tension in the Horn of Africa. We hope that the proposal by the USSR and the United States for an international conference on the Ethiopian issue may be helpful. However, it will only be of use if all the concerned parties genuinely work towards solving the problems of the republic, concludes Maksim Yevgenyev.

Nigerian Debt for Metallurgical Plant Overdue

90P50032 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 19 Jun 90 p 3

[Article by N. Shartse: "Will They 'Freeze' the Giant?"]

[Text] Remaining unresolved financial questions are creating serious difficulties for the Soviet side—Nigeria's main partner in the construction of the Ajaokuta Metallurgical Plant.

USSR Deputy Minister of Foreign Economic Relations O.D. Davydov stated this in Lagos. At a news conference at the USSR trade representation office he reported that Nigeria's debt for this enormous industrial facility has reached 1.2 billion German marks.

According to a Soviet representative, the metallurgical plant in Ajaokuta is already 90 percent completed and is supposed to come on line next year. USSR specialists have already installed 230,000 tons of metal design structures and 180,000 tons of equipment. All the rolling mills and auxiliary shops are completed, and construction of the blast furnace and coke-chemical production shops are continuing. The rolling mills are able to produce 100,000 tons of wire and 400,000 tons of construction reinforcements a year, as well as such items needed by Nigeria as girders and rolled metal. The smelting shop already can satisfy the country's needs. The electro-technical shop can be used for repairing electrical equipment and the machine shop is, in essence, the size of an average machine building plant.

"We are not insisting on immediate payment of the whole debt," O.D. Davydov emphasized. "But the time has come for it, otherwise we will not be able to finish the work. It is necessary jointly to determine mutually acceptable conditions for continuing construction." However, as of today, "there have been no suggestions from the Nigerians for repaying the debt."

"Expressing our readiness to develop fruitful cooperation with Nigeria, the Soviet Union is counting on finding a swift solution to all these existing problems," said the deputy minister.

East Europe

Yeltsin Meets With Polish Sejm Marshal

LD2006182690 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Petr Cheremushkin]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Supreme Soviet President Boris Yeltsin was able to set aside only one hour in between parliamentary sittings today to meet with a Polish delegation, headed by Sejm Marshal Mikolaj Kozakiewicz.

Describing the stormy progress at the Russian Congress of Deputies, Yeltsin remarked that pluralism was undoubtedly better than unanimity. "It teaches us to work in a coalition and take into account the interests of all the numerous groups at the forum."

Asked whether the experience of Polish reforms could be used on Russian soil, Yeltsin replied that much of what Poland carried out could be useful. "But we are not psychologically prepared for the drastic changes that are taking place in Poland," he said.

Polish 'Anti-Soviet Tendencies' Examined

WA2006200790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA correspondent L. Toporkov: "Why Lean to the Right?"]

[Text] Warsaw—Recently, I happened to read a striking refutation in a Warsaw newspaper. Supposedly, the word "comrade" was used in error in the obituary of a particular person. Therefore, an apology was made to the family of the deceased.

As is known, there is no communist party in present-day Poland. An old poet was jokingly outraged in the years now gone when he learned about the expulsions of individual citizens from the party: Why degrade the ranks of non-party members? Two million members of the former Polish United Workers Party have now suddenly become non-party members. At present, some people actually regard them exactly as "the dregs of society." The abusive word "nomenklatura" is still in use. They resort to it in order to scare "the has-beens," and mainly in order to give the impression that they, the "Czerwoni" ["Reds"; published in Polish transliterated into Russian] are to blame for all current difficulties and woes, even though they may have surrendered power of their own accord.

Nobody is even trying to question the fact that life is not easy for the people. "Are the resources of patience great?" is the question we asked in our newspaper in early April while analyzing the results of the first three months of implementing the Balcerowicz plan, the government program of switching to free-market principles in the economy of the country. It was expected that, as a reward for being rid of the horrors of a totalitarian regime, the Poles would go along with privation and hardship, and would tighten their belts in order to live better later, like under capitalism.

Voices are now being heard to the effect that the patience of the people is at an end, and its resources are being depleted. The well-known strike of railroad workers in northern areas of Poland in May became the first warning. However, the "Czerwoni" had nothing to do with organizing it. In general, the situation in the country now is such that "the has-beens" try to sit tight and keep a low profile. Meanwhile, all those who count themselves among the powers that be incite in society a hostile attitude toward them as the main source of evil. This is a proven technique. Fall guys are needed.

At present, the Poles are contemplating the results of recent elections to local self-management organs which were conceived as a way to smother the hated "nomenklatura" in the most common, lower-level organs of power. We should note that in the process all those who served the previous authorities were considered to be "nomenklatura" without distinction, including typists and drivers. Hundreds of thousands of the "has-beens" are to be eliminated in the course of the unfolding purge.

As they say here, the category of "superfluous people" is appearing who have difficulty finding a job.

As was expected, candidates of the Solidarity Citizens' Committees won the elections, and they came to hold sway in the self-government organs. The elections completed the process of creating a new nomenklatura and a new monopoly on power. Initially, the data released produced a shock: Only 42 percent of the citizens on the lists, i.e., 11 million people, came to the ballot boxes. Fifteen million voters stayed at home. At present, even these data are being interpreted as a success. Allegedly, the time has come for the people to abandon the infamous 99 percent and get used to European standards. Supposedly, Poland is returning to Europe now.

Of course, one may reassure himself in this manner as well. However, how are the real problems of life to be avoided? How can one fail to consider why 15 million, i.e., the bulk of the electorate, ignored the most significant political campaign? Were the elections not a strictly intra-Solidarity affair? It is said that they were not conceived as a referendum but were supposed to answer the question of who the people support at present. Alas, the elections still became a referendum, and there is no way to avoid this conclusion.

Not so long ago, Lech Walesa used to say that a society may only develop successfully when it firmly stands on its two feet, the left and the right. The political forces which now impose their will on the country and advocate pluralism clearly prefer one foot, the right one. The balance is being disrupted because only this foot is emphasized. The society is beginning to limp noticeably.

Quite logically, an offensive against the left in Poland is accompanied by the reinforcement of anti-Soviet tendencies. It has become a sign of good manners to demonstrate one's contempt for the neighbor to the East whether it is appropriate or not. Strangely, the time is gone when pronouncements about friendship and brotherhood were compulsory; the ideological binds which used to tie both sides are no more, and formal, ritualistic attributes of our former ties have disappeared—in a word, relations between our two countries should have become natural, normal. But, they are affected by the coolness of alienation and clouded by the relapses of chronic Russophobia. Anti-Sovietism is not expressed only through the demolition or desecration of monuments to Soviet soldier-liberators here and there. Hooligan attacks against Soviet consulates (Gdansk, Krakow) have become more frequent, which does not at all contribute to the positive image of Poland abroad.

A letter from a female resident of Warsaw, J. Kolas, overflowing with concern, was published in the SDRP [Social Democrats of the Republic of Poland] newspaper TRIBUNA. She wrote: "In a school in the capital city, a teacher devoted an entire lesson in the fourth grade to Polish-Soviet relations. The woman who, judging by her age, undoubtedly survived the years of German occupation, told her pupils: Remember that never in your life

should you shake hands with them, the Soviets, and you should never help them. Trust only our neighbors to the West; they are the only ones who can be trusted."

In another school, the director admonished his students in the following manner: "Until recently, I could not tell you this, but now we have freedom, and, therefore, I will say this: Our greatest enemy is to the East. Remember this for as long as you live."

In how many other Polish schools are the teachers administering such "lessons?"

Freedom. Of course, there is no dearth of it in Poland now. The strange thing is that they primarily want to use it against the neighbor to the East, and this cannot but make one wary. However, do all the people here use freedom to that extent? For example, the railroad workers were free to begin a hunger strike and strike for several weeks, fighting for salary increases. The government was also free to reject their demands. After all, strikes were good and desirable for as long as the "komuna" ["communist system"; published in Polish transliterated into Russian] was in power. At present, they are nothing else but an encroachment on democracy, on "one's own house."

Many observers of the political scene have voiced their apprehension: Have the notes of triumph not appeared prematurely in the ruling circles and in official propaganda? As far as the oppression of the leftist forces is concerned, perhaps, everything is right on target in this sphere. Things are much more complicated in the economy, which should sober up those who prefer to hop around on their right foot.

Five months under "the Balcerowicz plan" have not imparted more optimism, though they have not closed a safety-valve for hope. This is how well-known Polish economist Professor J. Kaleta commented on the progress in implementing the government program.

The professor stated: "We should not be introducing a market overnight; at least two to three years are necessary for this. An attempt to introduce consumer, investment, capital, and labor markets radically and simultaneously will cause a social and economic upheaval in society. To avoid this, it is necessary to create adequate prerequisites through reforms in the structure of property and demonopolization, change the finance and tax systems of the state, and create the infrastructure of the capital market—banks and exchanges. This cannot be accomplished in several months. Furthermore, there is a privatization program. I am not against this process, but we need to realize clearly that it is not a cure-all for all troubles. The consequences of implementing the 'Balcerowicz plan' once again affirm my conviction as to this: It has perniciously affected exactly the private sector, peasant farms, and the shops of craftsmen. One more thing: If the goal of privatization is to improve the efficiency of our economy, why should we begin by

selling off the best state enterprises?" The professor believes that "the Balcerowicz plan" is in need of resolute revisions.

In a word, freedom is necessary if the entire society is to take part in its own restructuring. Why lean to the right if you can move along normally on two feet? As they say here, the slogan of national accord cannot include "witch-hunting" and ideological intolerance.

Poland's Mazowiecki on Free Market Plan

WA1906192590 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 24, 13 Jun 90 p 14

[Report by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent O. Prudkov and columnist Leonid Pochivalov on interview with Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki in Warsaw; date not given: "Balcerowicz's Plan Is Working"]

[Text] [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] The transition in Poland to a market economy is being watched with great interest in the Soviet Union. A lot is being said in our country about "Balcerowicz's plan." How do you assess the economic situation of the country? What can be said about the first results of "Balcerowicz's plan" and about its future prospects.

[Mazowiecki] It can be said that the so-called Balcerowicz plan is already bringing tangible results today. First and foremost, hyperinflation has been brought under control. It had a murderous effect on the economy, and it perceptibly affected the population, principally the peasantry most likely. We achieved internal convertibility of gold with respect to the dollar. The situation on the market improved sharply. As a result of measures in demonopolization, enterprises are beginning to compete among themselves, and they are lowering prices for goods more and more frequently. These are the positive facts. And the negative ones, although foreseen and inevitable, are the costs of our operation: lowering of the real incomes of the population, and the drop in production by almost 30 percent.

At the present time, it should be assumed that this process has slowed down, and we are already beginning to see definite symptoms of growth. The future—on the one hand, there is the perestroika of the structure and the bankruptcy of part of the unprofitable enterprises, and, on the other hand, privatization, which we want to start this year as soon as the appropriate legal acts are adopted by parliament. If we succeed in moving the economy and creating new enterprises, then unemployment will not reach a dangerous level.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] Revolutionary changes have occurred in Eastern Europe. Obviously, it is necessary to analyze the situation that has developed. What kind of society do you intend to create? Is a new model of socialism possible? And if not, what other kind?

[Mazowiecki] I would like the market economy in Poland to combine with elements of a judiciously organized state that protects its citizens. A judiciously organized state is the kind of state that defends the really weak, and not the spongers. But we try not to think either about capitalism or about socialism—categories that have a powerful ideological nuance.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] What are CEMA's possibilities? Perhaps a policy on some kind of integration with the EEC would be more realistic?

[Mazowiecki] CEMA is already being transformed into an organization that is playing more of a consultant role than that of a conductor of production and trade. We discuss within its framework part of the difficult problems associated with changes in the procedure for mutual settlements. At the same time, we are resolutely switching to a system of bilateral arrangements and agreements between individual enterprises. Time will tell whether CEMA will be preserved in some form. However, it is already clear today that all of the countries of Central Europe are striving for rapprochement and cooperation with the EEC in some form, and certainly also for membership in the European Economic Community in the future.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] The unification of Germany will obviously be a very important factor in the near future. What is your attitude toward this event and, in particular, toward the possibility of Germany entering NATO? Considering the mood in a number of East European countries, how do you evaluate the situation in the Warsaw Pact Organization?

[Mazowiecki] The unification of Germany is the most important historical event in the postwar life of Europe. But without a united Germany, there is no united Europe. It is most important that Germany enters the system of European institutions, and that it is included in the process of European integration. Then it will not be dangerous to its neighbors. Germany's participation in NATO should be viewed in this context. But as for the Warsaw Pact, it requires profound reforms. The role of both military pacts is changing radically and, it seems, in the proper direction. This means that the military factor has increasingly less significance in them. The cause of peace can only gain from this.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] What do you see as Poland's role in post-revolutionary Europe? On what new approaches should Soviet-Polish relations be built? Do you believe as previously that the Soviet Union is and will remain a great power?

[Mazowiecki] Polish-Soviet relations must be built on the principle of mutual respect, sovereignty, and partnership, without the ideological factor. And, in fact, this is what our bilateral relations have already become: The Soviet Union is and will remain a great power with whom good neighbor relations have a special meaning for us. Speaking about Poland, I would like it to contribute to the unity of our continent and that, in the

difficult historical process of European evolution, the Republic of Poland will be a simultaneously dynamic and stabilizing factor.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] What do you think of the events in the Baltics?

[Mazowiecki] Poland, which we have said many times, understands and supports the aspirations of the people for self-determination. It is important to be able to respect the hopes and legitimate interests of all parties in the framework of this process.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] The change in the situation in Eastern Europe has led to the breakdown of our old systems of contacts. We think that direct professional ties are necessary. For this purpose, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA jointly with the Polish weekly POLITYKA intends to organize a club of representatives of the intelligentsia of other countries which will implement political and cultural programs. What do you think of the idea of the creation of a Soviet-Polish club?

[Mazowiecki] I like the idea very much. I consider valuable all contacts between our peoples that help us know each other better, to understand and like each other, and to overcome insults.

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA] What does the Gorbachev-Bush meeting give us Europeans, specifically Poland?

[Mazowiecki] As a result of the last war, both of these great powers carry part of the responsibility for Europe. I believe that the reduction of troops on our continent is an extremely important problem, and also the preparation of proposals for the forthcoming meeting of leaders of states that signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in Helsinki.

Yazov, Lizichev on All-European Security

PM1906160190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Colonel P. Chernenko report: "With the Central Group of Forces Antiaircraft Gunners"]

[Text] Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, who was visiting the Central Group of Forces, went to a antiaircraft missile unit which is soon to return home. At a meeting with unit officers held at the garrison officers' house the USSR defense minister spoke about the activity of the Soviet Government and the Communist Party aimed at reducing tension in the world and strengthening all-European security.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov dwelt in detail on problems connected with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, participated in the meeting.

Moiseyev, Lizichev Meet GDR People's Army Group

PM2006150390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "On a Friendly Visit"]

[Text] A delegation of officials from the GDR National People's Army State and Civil Work Directorate headed by Directorate Chief Major General O. Anders was in the Soviet Union 12-14 June at the invitation of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The delegation was received by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister.

Discussions took place with Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. Colonel General G.A. Stefanovskiy and other political workers took part in them. The discussions were held in a businesslike, friendly atmosphere. Maj. Gen. O. Anders addressed generals and officers of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The GDR guests visited the USSR Armed Forces General Staff K.E. Voroshilov Military Academy and the V.I. Lenin Military and Political Academy.

DSU 'Reckless Race' to German Unity Criticized

PM2006154790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by correspondent V. Lapskiy: "Unification at a Stroke?"]

[Text] Eerlin—The extraordinary session of the GDR People's Chamber on Sunday opened two hours late. Deputies and guests of honor—FRG parliamentarians, including Chancellor H. Kohl, who had been invited—were kept waiting. Something unprecedented happened—the German Social Union [DSU] parliamentary party put forward a demand that the GDR be incorporated in the FRG on the basis of Article 23 of the West German Fundamental Law "as of today."

It is perfectly obvious that the DSU had not chosen this day by accident. June 17—the anniversary of the suppression of the 1953 uprising in East Berlin—which has up to now been commemorated in West Germany as German Unity Day, was this year for the first time being publicly marked in the GDR. This was the pretext for the presence in the People's Chamber of Bundestag deputies and Chancellor Kohl.

Heated debates broke out in the GDR parliament and emotions boiled over. As a result, the sensational proposal of the DSU was passed on for examination in the appropriate parliamentary commissions. It may accelerate the process of unification of the two German states, but there can clearly be no question of any kind of "instantaneous" solution.

The first to take the floor was Prime Minister Lothar de Maiziere. He expressed agreement in principle with the DSU proposal but drew deputies' attention to the following circumstances. First, in his opinion, another state treaty is required before the incorporation of the GDR in the FRG, and this has not even been discussed yet; second, the GDR must switch to a new administrative division into lands which is yet to be implemented; and, finally, a "careful structural fusion" of the internal and external aspects of German unification is needed. De Maiziere proposed that the DSU initiative be examined in parliamentary commissions.

Resolute calls protesting against immediate liquidation of the GDR rang out from opposition benches. Incidentally, there was no unity in the opposition ranks as regards this question. One of the prominent opposition figures, Konrad Weiss, a member of the "Alliance-90/Greens" coalition said that in his opinion the road to German unity must lead through the elaboration of a joint German Constitution and its adoption on the basis of a nationwide referendum. He sharply criticized the ruling coalition's "reckless feverish activities, devoid of political sense, in the question of unification" and also the "exclusion of the People's Chamber from the elaboration and discussion of a state treaty" and the rejection of the "draft new GDR Constitution elaborated by the roundtable." Deputy Jens Reich, who is a member of the same coalition, spoke in a similar vein. German unification cannot be achieved at a stroke; key preconditions include guarantees in respect of the German-Polish border, definition of the military status of a unified Germany, and the in the GDR creation of an administrative structure based on lands. Hans Modrow, former head of government and Party of Democratic Socialism deputy, favored a democratic path toward unity based on awareness of national responsibility at this hour. It is a matter of confidence on the part of neighbors and European peoples and generally accepted international norms. H. Modrow recalled the promise contained in the government statement "to lead citizens toward unity directly and with dignity." Yet today, in the deputy's words, "there is clear evidence of the government's inability to control the complex and demanding process of unification and to cope with it." He also called for a nationwide referendum on the question of a unified Germany's constitution.

Richard Schroeder, chairman of the parliamentary Social Democratic Party, declared that German unity must be achieved in agreement with the big powers. If unification takes place today "the Soviet Union will have to be notified by tonight that 400,000 of its servicemen are located within the sphere of operation of the Fundamental Law of the FRG. The Soviet Union cannot be treated in this way."

As is known, the foreign ministers' "two-plus-four" conference is opening in Berlin on Friday of this week. It will discuss paths toward German unity in the light of European and international processes. People I have talked to here are expressing the opinion that the haste

with which the DSU and its supporters are trying to act in the matter of German unification may prove damaging and undermine the Europeans' confidence. Unification is not a purely internal German affair, and no one stands to gain from a reckless race toward it that ignores the rights and interests of other peoples.

Bulgarian Opposition Tactics Criticized

PM2006134190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents L. Zhmyrev and A. Krushinskiy: "Bulgarian Option"]

[Text] Sofia, 15 Jun—The official results of the first round of elections to Bulgaria's Grand National Assembly were finally made public yesterday, Thursday. The Bulgarian Socialist Party [BSP] won 172 deputies' seats while the opposition Union of Democratic Forces [UDF], the Movement for Rights and Freedoms (representing the interests of the Muslim sector of the population), and the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union won 107, 21, and 16 seats respectively. The fate of another 81 mandates will be decided 17 June during the second round.

Even if the BSP lost all the "bouts" in the coming second round, we can talk of an impressive victory for it: The BSP does, after all, have 43 percent of all deputies' seats today! The victory has been won in an honest and fitting manner.

At a press conference for Bulgarian and foreign journalists on the results of the first round, Aleksandur Lilov, chairman of the BSP Higher Party Council, accounted for this success in the following way: The BSP was able to effect substantial self-renewal; it elaborated a realistic election platform in a short period; it compiled a good list of candidate deputies; and, last, it conducted the election campaign in a calm, responsible fashion under the slogans of dialogue and national accord....

So, we come to the self-renewal of the party. It is rooted in the events of 10 November 1989, when Todor Zhivkov's grouping was ousted from the leadership, and in a number of subsequent bold decisions aimed at democratizing the country's entire life. The new leaders of the Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] (later renamed the BSP) strove in the period 1989-1990 to cancel Zhivkov's course of forcibly Bulgarianizing the Turkish-speaking population, renounced on their own initiative the constitutional enshrinement of the BCP's leading role, agreed to introduce a multiparty system, simultaneously creating conditions for normal political activity by the opposition (they were, for instance, given a large building on Rakovski Street in Sofia), and entered into constructive "roundtable" dialogue with it. The party's extraordinary 14th congress (January-February 1990) was a turning point in party history in the full sense of the word.

Its work was notable for its exceptional democracy, expressed, for instance, in speeches from the forum's rostrum by Communists representing various platforms within the party. The new statutes adopted by the congress introduced the principle of democratic unity instead of democratic centralism.

You remember that many of the speakers proposed a change in the party's name, justifying this by the need to completely get away from the mistakes of the past and to avoid future accusations from the opposition of adherence to Stalinism. The BCP's new leaders declared a partywide referendum, the upshot being that almost 87 percent of the 726,000 Communists who filled in ballot papers favored a new name—the Bulgarian Socialist Party. The fact is that support was voiced for the party's main aim—of creating a society based on democratic socialism in Bulgaria.

BSP leaders have shown themselves to be politicians capable of plotting several moves ahead, as they say in chess: One felt that at the height of the 14th Congress they were already "thinking about" free multiparty elections in the near future. The congress' adopted manifesto (along with other documents, even the statutes) subsequently proved to contain the general outlines of the basic principles of the election platform.

To dwell on the one section that played a particularly important role in the election struggle—the economic section: The BSP's aim, the document says, is to overcome the economic crisis within a few years and open up the Bulgarian economy to the world. The BSP advocates rapid transition to a market economy by means of the rapid creation and development of its three fundamental elements—a commodity market, a capital market, and a labor market—a rapid transition, but not the "shock" transition which the opposition is calling for. "The UDF must say openly," the BSP platform pointed out, "that it is offering our people mass unemployment, unchecked price hikes, shocking inflation, the dissipation of a vast amount of our national income, and the rapid selling off of the few good things that Bulgaria possesses."

Speakers from the opposition UDF do not generally miss an opportunity of complaining that the BSP's election victory was allegedly facilitated by its hold on power in the country. A reproach that is known to be unjust: After all, the BSP offered to share power with the opposition four months ago, right after the 14th congress. But the UDF flatly refused to participate in government! In the belief, according to many observers, that the BSP would be compromised and would lose support by the time of the elections in conditions of economic collapse (aggravated by oppositionists "rocking the boat"), increasing shortages in the stores, and inflation.

What steps did the government headed by Andrey Lukanov take during the runup to the elections? The main difficulty is that the switch to a market economy had to be combined with the implementation of the government's special anticrisis program. This involves

thrift above all as one of the means of stabilizing the situation. Restrictions were imposed on imports, and an accord was secured to defer payment of the foreign debt for 90 days. Restrictions were lifted on the activity of small enterprises. Prices for basic food products were frozen. In the second half of 1990, 40 percent of all prices will be subjected to market regulation.

It is not enough, however, to prove your worth through actions here: you cannot do without words in the campaign for votes.

Many good things could be said about the BSP's wealth of visual agitation: Because the party retained within its ranks a considerable number of members of the artistic intelligentsia—writers, actors, artists—BSP posters were wonderfully diverse, bright, and witty. The newspaper DUMA was an important "trump card" for the left-wingers.

We will point out that more than 120 new newspapers appeared in Bulgaria after 10 November 1989, including opposition newspapers. But the entire opposition press headed by the newspapers DEMOKRATIA (published by the UDF) and SVOBODEN NAROD (the Social Democratic Party organ) was unable to counter DUMA alone. In the opinion of many of our interlocutors, it was DUMA that made a weighty contribution to the consolidation of BSP forces. It consistently conducted polemics with the opposition, revealing its weaknesses.

Unlike the BSP, the opposition (or at least its most reactionary section) banked on threats and on fueling passions. This may have been one of the reasons for its defeat.

Many people here believe that the opposition intimidated the average Bulgarian by its excessively direct and sometimes simply brazen onslaught on the "Reds." The country's entire 45-year history since 9 September 1944, when Bulgaria did away with monarchist fascism, was rejected. Slogans like "Death to Communists," "The BSP Is the Mafia," "Killers," and so on made millions of people shudder, reminding them of the "counterrevolutionary uprisings" [vandeyal] after the September anti-fascist uprising of 1923 and during the 1941-1944 period.

There is also another important element: The BSP and the traditions of the communist and socialist movement were not implanted in the country "from outside"; they date back almost 100 years.

The recurrences of anti-Sovietism did the oppositionists a disservice. The provocative rally held by the "independent students" outside the Soviet Embassy building 17 April, the "immuring" of the monument to Lenin in the center of Sofia with cardboard boxes on the 120th anniversary of his birth, the calls for Alesha—the monumental statue of the Soviet soldier liberator in Plovdiv—to be removed, and the flagrant attacks by the opposition press on Soviet journalists working in Bulgaria not only failed to win the people's backing, but

provoked condemnation and alarm. Carried away by attacks on the "Reds," the opposition seemed to forget that belief and trust in mother Russia, with whom Bulgarians traditionally associate their freedom and independence, is still alive deep within the popular consciousness.

However, the aspirations of the BSP, which we were told expected to win more than 50 percent of the votes, were not totally justified. Its undisputed election victory was also accompanied by a number of serious failures and disappointments. For instance, it was in Sofia and Plovdiv—the country's two largest cities, where, if you include the suburbs, almost one-fifth of the entire Bulgarian population lives—that the opposition won victory. Why? This problem remains to be thoroughly analyzed, but one should point out now that it was primarily young people who expressed sympathy for the opposition in these centers. What is the reason for this? Possibly, more skilled methods of street propaganda and an ability to play on people's feelings?

While increasing in numbers, the BSP has not made any great haste to break with those people who sullied themselves in the past—careerists, men of ambition, people adept at exploiting their official position for their own ends—and this is, of course, still adversely affecting the party's prestige.

Bulgaria has now been swamped by the rally syndrome. The streets are filled with people in broad daylight. You get the impression that no one is working. How will all this end? On election day we visited areas around the villages of Tserovo, Lesichevo, Vinogradets, and Karabunar near the city of Pazardzhik. We were struck by the unnatural sight of hundreds of hectares of cherry orchards unharvested, kilometer after kilometer. A magnificent harvest had ripened and was already beginning to rot on the branches. An economist friend told us that 1 kg of these berries sell for \$3. What is the reason for this?

"There's no one to harvest them," a local resident explained. "Everyone's attending rallies and fighting. They're saying that they don't know who'll come to power, but let whoever does bring in the harvest."

We saw in this not only the fetishization of the political struggle but also the defect of the old economic system: People who have no vital links with the land, with the instruments of their labor, and the end result are occasionally indifferent to something that has long been "national" property and hence belongs to no one.

Dropping into a snack bar on the corner of Freedom Park in the center of Bulgaria's capital after another rally, we saw a poster behind the barman shaped like a dollar from which Todor Zhivkov instead of George Washington looked at us from the center of the medalion. He has left the people and the party a difficult legacy. But humor is not going to help things. The problems that have accumulated over the decades must be resolved.

As for the BSP, it is striving to create a coalition government after the elections and recruit opposition leaders to it. But the opposition is, regrettably, behaving differently. Its leaders still reiterate implacably that they will not agree to any kind of cooperation with "communists." "We will not work with the Reds!" flushed young people declaim day and night. Many people do, however, realize that great ordeals lie ahead. Whether or not they work with the "Reds" or the "Blues," they still have to work. Just work. Rallies do not fill the stomach.

Second Round of Bulgarian Election Previewed

PM2006151390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian

18 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by PRAVDA special correspondents L. Zhmyrev and A. Krushinskiy under the rubric "Eastern Europe: Is Democracy the Opposition's Aim?": "Whose 'Trump Cards' Are the Strongest?"]

[Text] Sofia, 17 Jun—Today, 17 June, like last Sunday, the doors of polling stations have been open since morning. Not all of them, it is true. Following the first round of elections, only 81 of the 400 deputy seats remain "vacant." But the stakes are high: Today will decide the distribution of forces in the first multiparty parliament in the history of the People's Republic of Bulgaria.

Each of the 81 single-seat electoral districts now has two contenders (those who collected the greatest number of votes in the first round but failed to secure 50 percent "plus one vote"). In the overwhelming majority of cases, every such "couple" consists of a representative of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) and a representative of the opposition Union of Democratic Forces (UDF). Since the BSP currently has more than half of the deputy seats already filled (172 out of 319), that party would willingly settle for a "draw"—to use an expression popular among sports commentators these days—in the second round. After all, even if it won only 29 more seats, it would still have an overwhelming majority in the Grand National Assembly. However, the opposition is trying to substantially reduce the difference (and even overtake the Socialists). What are these hopes based on? Does the UDF hold any "trump cards" in this struggle? Yes, it does. First, Akhmed Dogan, leader of the Movement for Rights and Freedoms (representing the interests of the Muslim section of the population), asked his supporters to vote for the UDF when no one representing his own party was in the running. In our view, this is not very fair revenge against Bulgarian Socialists, who are having to pay for the sins of the Todor Zhivkov group, which tried to forcibly Bulgarianize the Turkish-speaking population of Bulgaria. Second, immediately after the first round of elections, Viktor Vulkov, leader of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union (BNAU)—a party that has traditionally cooperated with the Communists and bears responsibility for shortcomings permitted in the past—hastened to dissociate himself from the BSP and also urged members of the BNAU to vote

for representatives of the opposition. And, finally, supporters of the majority of small parties (monarchists and so forth) are set against the "Reds."

So, does this mean that everyone is against the BSP? Not quite, it seems. The newspaper DUMA has recently been publishing letters from ordinary members of the BNAU who categorically refuse to acknowledge their leadership's directives: "We have always worked together with the Communists and we are in favor of democratic socialism, so we will be voting for the BSP candidates."

There is no doubt that another factor will also play a role: On the eve of the elections, the leaders of the UDF said that they would recognize the election results and abide by the people's choice. In reality, however, the situation has turned out differently: The whole of the working week between the first and second rounds passed against the background of demonstrations by UDF supporters disappointed with the preliminary election results. Life was made difficult in Sofia and a number of other cities and transport was disrupted. Will this forceful onslaught compel voters to vote for opposition representatives? Many believe that the result could prove to be the exact opposite of this. Instances where someone gave preference to the "blue" (the UDF's color) candidate in the first round but drops a "red" ballot paper into the box this time around cannot be ruled out.

The results of the second round are expected to be announced on Tuesday.

Romanian Government 'Not Fully in Control'

PM2006150790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by correspondent V. Vedrashko under the rubric "East Europe: Is Democracy the Opposition's Aim?": "Who Benefits From This?"]

[Text] Bucharest, 17 Jun—After the dramatic events of 13-15 June, Bucharest is trying to gain the appearance of normality. Vehicles and pedestrians going about their daily business cross University Square, which is cordoned off by police, while a large round fountain spurts hundreds of jets of water into the air in the never-ending rain. The headquarters of the National Liberal Party looks through its smashed windows onto the avenue below.

The city is reaping the fruits of its vandalism. Television shows the same pictures: the television center, the Internal Affairs Ministry, the police station, and the Romanian Information Service. They have been hit hard by the attacks. In order to give a fuller picture, members of the National Liberal Party board yesterday invited journalists to survey their premises. And today, after obtaining a special permit, I also visited the headquarters of the National Peasants' Party.

Bucharest is not the only city to have experienced the turmoil. Having waited for the situation to get relatively

back to normal, today's issue of the newspaper ADEVARUL carried a report on the real terror unleashed in the city of Miercurea-Ciuc on 13-14 June. This is a regional center in the heart of Transylvania with a mixed population of Hungarians and Romanians. According to the newspaper, antistate and anti-Romanian slogans have been heard there.

The events of recent days show that the situation in Romania is still uneasy. Judging by the ineffectiveness of forces responsible for maintaining order, the authorities are not fully in control of the situation. They are having to appeal to the working class for help—who often do not know the first thing about the law.

It is clear from the official communique published today in the press that the government has given instructions for real, decisive measures to be taken to investigate and bring criminal charges against everyone guilty of unlawful actions on 13 and 14 June and subsequent days.

Calm Proves 'Deceptive'

PM2106080790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Volodin: "Bucharest: University Square Again"]

[Text] Come to Patriarch Hill by the parliament on Monday at 1000. They say that the president will be sworn in. We will stage a protest—said a girl approaching a group of foreign journalists who had fallen silent as she came near.

Judging by appearances, she had mistaken us for demonstrators who in full sight of subunits of servicemen armed with automatic weapons and nightsticks had again, unhindered, brought road traffic in the center of the Romanian capital to a halt.

Meanwhile, nothing pointed to such a turn of events last Sunday. Despite the heavy rain which had washed away the traces of soot on the capital's streets from burned-out cars and police buses, people were making their way to parks and theater and movie ticket selling offices. However, the peace and calm proved deceptive.

Forces were already slowly gathering, about to break into cries of "Down with Iliescu!" "Iliescu to the dock for the spilled blood!" Demonstrators, mainly young people, among whom familiar figures who took part in the recent clashes with the police could again be glimpsed, began to gather in small groups from 1800 hours onward on the corner of Architects Street near University Square. When approximately 200 people had gathered, the crowd entered the Square, where, bringing traffic to a halt, it organized an anti-government rally. Following a report about the demonstration in the evening newscast on television, curious onlookers began to flock to the square. Proclamations signed by the "16-21 December" Association, the "People's Alliance," and the League of

Students who played an active part in the blockade of the square and the 13 June events, were distributed among them.

I see no point in reproducing the slogans which the demonstrators chanted. I will merely say that they were all anti-government, and were directed mainly against President Ion Iliescu of Romania. Among the crowd, whose nucleus was formed by a group of unshaven guys, unkind words were being said about the miners.

I cannot, of course, justify the actions of the miners in Bucharest, to which many people who had nothing to do with the insurgents fell victim. However, I assume that there is some truth in the words of those Romanians who believe that the miners were essentially the only force which expressed full confidence in the government. As for the "strange" behavior of the army at the outset of the events, it cannot be denied that there is no unity of opinions among its command personnel as regards the very complex situation which has taken shape in Romania and that therefore it prefers not to intervene in the country's internal affairs. Although it is perfectly obvious that it is the law enforcement organs—and in emergency circumstances also the army—rather than civilians which must counter the actions of extremist forces.

This opinion was expressed also by Senator R. Campeanu, chairman of the National Liberal Party, at a press conference which he gave for Romanian and foreign journalists in his apartment. The whole of Romania has lost out as a result of the arrival of the miners, and Bucharest especially, since contradictions there between the various social groups of the population have deepened and opinions have become more divided and are threatening to turn into direct confrontation.

It seems now that the parliamentary opposition will be able to strengthen its position. This is also borne out by the Declaration of the Democratic Union of Hungarians which was broadcast by Romanian television and in which the second parliamentary party expressed its disagreement with the actions of the authorities. What position parliament will assume will be shown up by the separate sittings of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies scheduled for Monday.

West Europe

Shevardnadze Receives Austrian Vice Chancellor

LD2006201690 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met today Austrian Vice-Chancellor Josef Riegler, on an official visit in the USSR.

They had a lively discussion of the main directions of the development of the all-European process. Shevardnadze stressed that the Soviet Union favours the formation in

Europe of new structures in the military, political, economic, humanitarian and other spheres, permitting to create a reliable system of security and cooperation on the continent. The sides pointed to the important role played by neutral and non-aligned countries in the creation of an all-European home.

Riegler reaffirmed that the approaches and stands of Austria and the Soviet Union on problems dealing with the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are almost identical. The Austrian side intends to promote the progress of the all-European process in every way.

When discussing other topical problems of the current situation in Europe, the sides focused attention on foreign aspects of the German settlement within the framework of the "two-plus-four" mechanism.

The sides stated with satisfaction that Soviet-Austrian relations are developing with a dynamism typical of them and said that they were interested in their further development.

On the same day Shevardnadze and Riegler signed a programme of cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and Austria for 1990-1993.

Discuss All-Europe Security

AU2006164690 Vienna Domestic Service in German 1600 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Christian Schueller report from Moscow]

[Text] In the course of his visit to Moscow, Austrian Vice Chancellor Josef Riegler met with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze today. During their talks, Shevardnadze assured the chairman of the Austrian People's Party [OeVP] that the USSR will support the idea that the planned CSCE secretariat should be based in Vienna. The issue of Austria's membership in the EC and neutrality was not discussed. Christian Schueller has a report.

Pressed by the tempo of the Germans in East and West, Moscow's foreign policy is also accelerating its speed. Shevardnadze has agreed that the way could be paved for an agreed solution before the end of this year. He says that this would, however, require a Western guarantee for the Soviet Union, such as a nonaggression pact between the two military blocs.

That was stated by Eduard Shevardnadze following his meeting with Vice Chancellor Josef Riegler today—a talk during which the Soviet foreign minister and close confidant of Mikhail Gorbachev appeared to be relaxed and optimistic, irrespective of all domestic and foreign policy problems.

Neither the criticism voiced during the RSFSR Party Congress nor the dissatisfaction of the military quarters can make him and Gorbachev give up their basic concept of a common European home. Shevardnadze sees

the neutral and nonaligned countries as the vanguard for restructuring Europe. He would consider Vienna in particular to be the ideal seat of a permanent secretariat of the European Security Conference. Moscow would also like to see the foreign ministers' conference of the 35 CSCE signatory states take place in Vienna. So this is good news for the visitor from Austria.

Eduard Shevardnadze also praised the United States. He said that at the Washington summit meeting, the United States showed that it understands the East European problems much better than it did in the past. The Soviet foreign minister even went so far as to state that he could put up with the permanent U.S. military presence in Europe, if the West Europeans so wished. Thus Shevardnadze is continuing the tactic that Gorbachev presented in Washington. Unless the Soviet Union wants to be pushed out of Europe, it needs a strong ally, and that is the United States.

Baden-Wuerttemberg Leader Meets With Officials

Discuss Economic Ties

LD2006130190 Moscow TASS in English
1250 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Minister-President of the West German land of Baden-Wuerttemberg Dr. Lothar Spaeth, who is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Russian Federation's Council of Ministers, was received by Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Ivan Silayev today.

They summed up the results of talks held at the Russian Federation's Council of Ministers, in the Republic's ministries and departments. Negotiations sought to determine directions and concrete opportunities for economic, scientific, technological, cultural and educational cooperation to be established when Russia's state sovereignty and economic independence are stronger. The sides agreed that there are favourable conditions for mutually advantageous cooperation.

The arrangements are reflected in the joint statement about widening cooperation and developing friendly ties between the Russian Federation and Baden-Wuerttemberg.

Holds Talks With Gorshkov

LD1806172690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1209 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS)—The state and the future of the development of connections between Russia and the Land of Baden-Wuerttemberg (FRG) in the spheres of economy, science and technology, culture, art, sport, and tourism were discussed in the conversation between Leonid Gorshkov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, and Lothar Spaeth, minister-president of the Federal Land of Baden-Wuerttemberg, which took place here today.

They shared the opinion that the processes taking place in the RSFSR and the FRG at present are creating favorable preconditions for the more effective use of existing opportunities to strengthen and to expand cooperation, which is mutually beneficial, to organize direct cooperative ties between the RSFSR enterprises and their appropriate partners from Baden-Wuerttemberg, and to set up joint Russian-German enterprises.

Lothar Spaeth, who is accompanied by members of the government and a large group of representatives of business, scientific and cultural circles of Baden-Wuerttemberg Land, is in the Soviet Union on an official visit at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

The RSFSR Council of Ministers gave a dinner in the guest's honor in the evening.

Meets With Gorbachev

PM2106092390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second
Edition 21 Jun 90 p 1

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today met Dr. Lothar Spaeth, minister-president of West Germany's Baden-Wuerttemberg State.

The West German official is in the Soviet Union within the framework of traditional contacts between the Russian Federation and Baden-Wuerttemberg. The two know each other well, and their conversation immediately acquired the character of a businesslike, substantive discussion.

The Soviet president stressed that at the current stage of historic changes in Europe, it is very important to preserve and multiply all the accomplishments of the past years. It is necessary to act so that relations between the two countries attain a new level in the context of German unification.

Spaeth backed this idea, observing that the future of Europe was connected with extensive Soviet-German cooperation. He said that stable economic relations are necessary for stability in the sphere of security.

Gorbachev and Spaeth discussed specific issues in developing economic relations between the two countries. They agreed that favorable conditions existed for this development.

The point at issue is, specifically, the creation of new models of cooperation between West Germany's small and medium-size companies and Soviet enterprises. It is also envisaged to make extensive use of the opportunities that emerge in connection with conversion.

The talk, which was distinguished by openness and mutual understanding, was attended by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy and K. Blech, FRG ambassador to the USSR.

Shevardnadze on Two Germanys, NATO-Pact

*AU2006182990 Vienna Television Service in German
1700 GMT 20 Jun 90*

[Interview with Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by ORF correspondent Christian Schueller in Moscow on 20 June; Shevardnadze answers in Russian with passage by passage German translation—recorded]

[Text] [Schueller] Could a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact dispel your concerns about German unification?

[Shevardnadze] I think it is difficult to take just one element; however, new relations between the blocs will certainly allow us to remove the difficulties in connection with the German question.

[Schueller] Before the end of this year, as expected by Helmut Kohl?

[Shevardnadze] I think so, yes. A lot will depend on the NATO summit in London. You know the resolutions that the Warsaw Pact adopted at its recent summit. It is now up to our partners to reform themselves.

Possibility of Germany's NATO Membership Noted

*AU2006112690 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER
ALLGEMEINE in German 20 Jun 90 p 6*

["kho." report: "Dashichev: Compromise Possible"]

[Text] Frankfurt/Main, 19 June—"Three months ago when I said that the integration of a united German state into NATO would not threaten the security of the Soviet Union, I was still criticized by the Foreign Ministry spokesman." Vyacheslav Dashichev, deputy director of the Moscow Institute for East European and International Studies, who is currently attending a conference at the Hesse Foundation for Peace and Conflict Research in Oberursel near Frankfurt, feels that the course of the negotiations on German unity have confirmed his opinion. However, in the USSR there are still many people who do not want to give up the symmetry of the blocs, Dashichev added: Ligachev and his circle within the CPSU, as well as the army leaders. They like to point to the victims that were the price the USSR had to pay for establishing the post-war order.

Dashichev is optimistic and believes that, within the framework of the disarmament talks, it will be possible to find a compromise for the main problems of German unification, namely military integration. Yet, since the "two-plus-four" talks are being outpaced by the process of unification, it is conceivable to him that some of the problems are finally solved after the unification within the framework of "one-plus-four" talks. For this last stage of the talks the former "victor powers" might retain special rights in Germany—formally, as Dashichev pointed out. Such special rights will of course cease to exist in a sovereign German state.

Dashichev also pointed out that the 28th CPSU Congress in July, at which the party might even split up, will have a decisive impact on the entire power structure in the USSR, which will also affect foreign policy. Although almost 50 percent of the party members sympathize with the "Democratic Platform," which wants to introduce the market economy and parliamentary democracy with parties in the USSR and depoliticize the army and the police. Yet, at the congress in July—as a consequence of manipulations by the nomenklatura, as Dashichev pointed out—almost one half of the delegates come from the apparatus, while the "Democratic Platform" only accounts for two percent of the delegates. Therefore, Dashichev does not pin great hopes into this party congress.

If its ideas are not supported at the party congress in July, the "Democratic Platform" is set to establish a party of its own, which might be described as "liberal democratic" rather than social democratic, Dashichev said. Members of the "Democratic Platform" do not think that a social democratic party would stand great chances, partly because of the only weak social democratic tradition in Russia, yet also because all things connected with socialism have been brought into discredit in the country. Nevertheless, this reservation must be mainly seen as ideological. As far as practical politics is concerned, the population of the USSR will certainly want to maintain strong regulatory intervention into the economy on the part of the state, and a considerable share of state property for a long time to come.

Genscher Optimistic About Achieving Unity

*PM2006145390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7*

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent Ye. Grigoryev: "Symbols and Politics. E.A. Shevardnadze's Meeting With H.-D. Genscher"]

[Text] Munster-Bonn, Jun—Munster is charming. I almost said a charming "town," but I stopped myself: It has 250,000 inhabitants. Restored from the ruins of war, the city's medieval center with its old cathedrals and cozy, mainly red-brick houses looking clean and well cared-for, are like a kind of miniature painting. But E.A. Shevardnadze had no time to stroll through Munster's streets. He only visited the smart and crowded Prinzipalplatz and the nearby city hall. It was there that he held his latest meeting—the eighth this year—with his West German colleague H.-D. Genscher.

Apart from the two countries' capitals, the geography of these meetings is gradually expanding to take in third countries and, of late, new venues in the USSR and the FRG—which bring new symbolism to the ministers' talks. There is no need to talk about Brest, where the previous meeting was held a week ago. Munster has gone down in history because it was there in 1648 that the Peace of Westphalia, which marked the end of the exhausting and destructive Thirty Years' War in Europe, was signed. At the time 230 diplomats held talks in

Munster and nearby Osnabrueck. Thirty-three of them are depicted in portraits in the historic Peace Hall of Munster City Hall, and there is still room for new portraits on the wall. It was there that Mayor J. Twenhoeven welcomed the two ministers. However, Munster—and everyone realized this—could only be the latest interim stage on the road to the accords needed in order to settle the external aspects of the building of German unity.

Regular meetings between the Soviet and FRG foreign ministers, sessions of the group set up under the "two-plus-four" formula for the aforesaid purpose, and sessions of experts from the "Big Six" show that there has been progress in this area. Otherwise there would be no point in getting around the table in order to stake out positions and conduct talks. The job is very big. And the responsibility of its participants is high. Since history has decreed the unification of Germany, we must not only guarantee that there is no repetition of the past. We also need something more—to grasp this unique opportunity to move toward a new Europe of peace and cooperation, and toward the creation of all-European structures in the security sphere too. The old recipes of bloc politics will not suffice.

While the ministers were meeting at City Hall the journalists who had descended on Munster were killing their time at the press center waiting for news and the promised news conference. Genscher, who spoke at the news conference, was very upbeat. He grouped together and described the range of problems discussed at Munster City Hall. His assessments and forecasts were diplomatically vague and optimistic about the possibility of working out the new concepts and practical measures needed to resolve aspects of German unity by the end of the year.

To a certain extent these expectations are justified. After all, E.A. Shevardnadze too confirmed that some of the sides' concepts and approaches are close to each other or coincide—for instance, as regards a number of all-European constructs and the future of bilateral relations between our countries. However, he did point out the existence of still unresolved difficult problems associated above all with the safeguarding of European stability. In this sense the Soviet minister's statements seemed more balanced and realistic to me.

Recall that Bonn is currently expediting the process of German state unification, using different levers to that end. The objective conditions for such a development undoubtedly exist. But, in my view, subjective aspects—such as personal ambition, the struggle for power, electoral considerations, and overly cautious assessments of the prospects for development in East Europe (above all, the Soviet Union)—are now becoming increasingly weighty. Chancellor H. Kohl, H.-D. Genscher, and other representatives of the FRG ruling camp are openly setting their sights on the pan-German elections this year. What does this mean for the external aspects of the problem? Will not the work of the "two plus four" group

thereby find itself in the Procrustean bed of Bonn's plans? And, moreover, is it appropriate to impose deadlines for foreign policy when it is a question of problems on whose resolution the future of not just the Germans but all the European people will depend?

The subtext of some of Genscher's statements at the press conference prompts the thought that Bonn's main aim is to eliminate the rights and responsibilities of the four great powers, while a united Germany's participation in NATO is seen as virtually axiomatic, although for many people this remains an issue that needs a cogent response. After all, NATO is still a powerful military machine. Apart from the Bundeswehr there are U.S., French, British, Canadian, Netherlands, and Belgian troops in the FRG—almost a million men taken as a whole. And what about the thousands of nuclear warheads? Of course, the changes in Europe and the transformation of the Warsaw Pact are presenting NATO with the problem of finding a motive for such a powerful military presence on German soil. The West German public—young people above all—are asking more and more persistently why a half-million-strong Bundeswehr is needed. However, Bonn is still avoiding giving a clear-cut answer to the question of what will happen to its Armed Forces. Instead you can increasingly hear talk of some kind of "discrimination" if German armed forces numbers are to be discussed at "Big Six" level rather than in Vienna. But is it really a matter of form? Nonetheless, that is how Bonn is concerned about its "national prestige." It seems to me that its prestige would be all the higher if it were more open and constructive in its concern to provide a new life for the united German state within the framework of new pan-European structures, leaving behind no ambiguity and prompting only confidence in a united Germany.

One would like to believe that this is how things will be. On the whole, the position and approaches of the FRG, as set out by Genscher, are dominated by realism and realization of the need to work out conditions—not least in the security sphere—which would satisfy all parties involved in the German unification process. However, even after Munster this will still take a lot more effort. The work will be continued at the "two-plus-four" group session in Berlin Friday 22 June. Other meetings—including bilateral meetings—will be held too.

For Munster, which is unused to "urban bustle," the ministers' meeting was a real event. The city's thousands of residents milled around City Hall all day. Some of them came with home-made banners stating "No to War!", "People Don't Want the National People's Army or the Bundeswehr Any More," and "Cut Arms!" Particularly noticeable among the banners was a large placard in Russian stating "NATO—Nyet." I approached the guys holding it. They turned out to be students. One of them, Frank Vossel, explained his act as follows: "The Warsaw Pact has ceased to be a military bloc—that means there's no point in NATO either." On the whole, a logical view.

British, Soviet UN Groups Support End to Blocs*PM2006140390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4*

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Krivopalov: "The Main Thing Is a Security System"]

[Text] London—A meeting of Soviet and British representatives of national UN Associations has been held in London. The participants focused on European issues. They were unanimous on the basic question of the need to create a lasting security system on the continent in the situation that is taking shape in connection with the unification of Germany. In order to ensure a stable peace it is necessary to eliminate both the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO. That was the common opinion expressed in the final communique.

The British participants stressed their commitment to the development of perestroika in the USSR and the settlement of the problems that have arisen in our country, since the fate of peace and security in Europe largely depends on this, they said.

There was a discussion of UN problems, particularly those connected with strengthening it and making it more effective in the political and socioeconomic spheres.

The representatives of the Soviet UN Association had meetings at the British parliament and at a number of branches of the British association.

British Air Force Exhibition Slated for Kiev*LD2006220690 Moscow TASS in English 2126 GMT
20 Jun 90*

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—The Red Arrows squadron of the British Royal Air Forces arrived in Leningrad on Wednesday. From there the British pilots will go to Kiev where they will make exhibition flights over the sports stadium Chaika on June 22 and June 23.

The Soviet Defence Ministry reported that the exhibition performances of the British pilots will be held as part of the British festival in the USSR and that they are organized by the Soviet Foreign Ministry, the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Ties With Foreign Countries and the USSR Ministry of Defence.

Hijacked Airliner Returns From Helsinki*LD2006115290 Moscow TASS in English 1146 GMT
20 Jun 90*

[Text] Riga June 20 TASS—A Tupolev-134B aircraft, hijacked to Helsinki on June 19 en route from Riga to Murmansk, returned to Riga at 2:37 Moscow time today.

The Finnish authorities detained the main culprit of the hijacking, 20-year-old Oleg Kozlov, of Saratov. Another two passengers are suspected of assisting him. The Soviet

plane was allowed to continue its interrupted flight to Murmansk. Having conveyed the passengers to the polar city, the Tu-134B returned to Riga.

Soviet competent bodies instituted criminal proceedings and set up an inquiry into the circumstances of the hijacking.

Voronin Meets With Turkey's Ozdemir 13 Jun*LD1506174790 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT
15 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister Lev Voronin Wednesday met with visiting Turkish State Minister Ibrahim Ozdemir, it was announced here today. During the conversation they discussed a wide range of questions relating to the state and prospects of Soviet-Turkish trade and economic relations.

The conversation was held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding.

Soviet, French Regional Commanders Meet in FRG*PM1506155690 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 15 Jun 90 First Edition p 3*

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel I. Kosenko report: "Meeting in Baden-Baden"]

[Text] Army General B.V. Snetkov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces, and those accompanying him visited the French Forces in Germany 12-13 June at the invitation of Corps General N. Chazaren [name as transliterated], commander in chief of the French Forces in Germany.

A talk between the commanders in chief took place at the French Forces in Germany headquartered in Baden-Baden. During the exchange of opinions the state of and prospects for the development of bilateral relations were discussed. Note was made of the important role of the Soviet and French military missions, which for more than 40 years have ensured a reliable and effective link between the commanders in chief and headquarters of the Western Group of Forces and the French Forces in Germany.

During the visit the Soviet delegation acquainted itself with the everyday life of French servicemen, visited the commando training center, examined specimens of weapons and combat equipment, and attended firing practice for various types of weapon.

The visit took place in a businesslike and amicable atmosphere and was an important event in further improving relations and developing mutual understanding between the Armed Forces of the USSR and France.

Supreme Soviet Delegation Arrives in France

LD1806153590 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1037 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Paris, 18 Jun (TASS)—A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Planning, Budget and Finance, headed by V.G. Kucherenko, chairman of the commission of the Soviet of the Union and a member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, arrived on an official visit to France today at the invitation of the country's National Assembly. During their stay in France, the Soviet delegation will become acquainted with the French parliament's experience of planning and budgeting work, will hold a whole series of working meetings with the leaders of various state institutions, whose task includes organizing planning, financial, and economic activities and will visit major state and private companies.

The visit by the Soviet delegation is to last until 24 June.

Icelandic President Finnbogadottir Ends Visit

PM1806085390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Visit Ends"]

[Text] Leningrad, 13 Jun—President V. Finnbogadottir of Iceland has ended her unofficial visit to the Soviet Union with a visit to Leningrad.

At the Hermitage she opened an exhibition "Heyday of Modernism. Scandinavian Painting 1910-1920," which comprises more than 100 canvases by nordic countries' artists. On Victory Square V. Finnbogadottir viewed the monument to Leningrad's World War II defenders and laid flowers at its central sculpture. She also visited Pushkin city.

Today V. Finnbogadottir left for home.

Describes Relations

LD1706210290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Report from Iceland by correspondent Vsevolod Shishkovskiy from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Today, 17 June, is Iceland's national holiday, the day it was proclaimed a republic.

It is early morning, and we have come to the spot regarded as sacred and dear to most Icelanders: the famous Concord of Law Cliff, which is behind us. It was here, back in 930 that the first meetings of the Althing, the country's parliament, were held. Another great event in Iceland's history is linked with this picturesque valley: On 17 June 1944 the country's independence was solemnly proclaimed. [passage omitted]

The trade and economic ties between our two countries go back to Viking times. Soviet ships are frequent visitors to Reykjavik, and our fruitful cooperation is continuing to grow.

Icelandic President Vigdis Finnbogadottir describes relations between our two countries as very good. I interviewed her in her residence. She stressed the great interest felt by Icelanders in the important transformations taking place in the Soviet Union and wishes our perestroika success.

All of us in Iceland, Mrs. Finnbogadottir said, entertain very happy memories of the Reykjavik summit, and we are proud that it was here, of all places, that the first step was taken toward better understanding between the two great powers, a step that has enabled an improvement to occur in the international atmosphere, and then a start to be made in the important process of reducing armaments. [video shows windswept expanse of land, aerial views of Reykjavik, rain and windswept Reykjavik streets, fisherman at work, geyser in action, two unidentified Soviet ships berthed in harbor, interview with president]

More on Dutch Defense Minister's Visit

PM2006155990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 20 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at USSR Ministry of Defense"]

[Text] Netherlands Defense Minister R. ter Beek arrived in the Soviet Union 18 June on an official visit at the invitation of Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

The guest and his entourage were met at the airport by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov; Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; and other generals and officers of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Among those greeting the guests were P. Buwalda, Netherlands ambassador to the Soviet Union; and also Brigadier General A.J. van Vuuren, defense attache at the Netherlands Embassy in the Soviet Union.

The state flags of the Netherlands and the Soviet Union were flown at the airport, an honor guard paraded on the runway, and both countries' national anthems were played.

On 19 June Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, met with Netherlands Defense Minister R. ter Beek, who is on an official visit to our country. Problems of mutual interest were discussed during the talks. The certainty was expressed that the development of military contacts within the framework of multifaceted Soviet-Dutch links furthers

the strengthening of trust and mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the Netherlands.

Taking part in the talks were: on the Soviet side—Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and other officials; and on the Dutch side—P. Buwalda, Netherlands ambassador to the USSR, and General P.J. Graaf, chief of the Netherlands Armed Forces General Staff.

The USSR and Netherlands defense ministers signed an Agreement on Preventing Incidents at Sea.

The same day, the guest from the Netherlands visited the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy, where he was familiarized with the organization of the training process and the academy's and laboratory facilities. R. ter Beek addressed the professorial and teaching staff and students of the academy.

The Netherlands defense minister laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at the Kremlin Wall.

In the afternoon R. ter Beek visited the Taman Motorized Infantry Guards Division, where he was familiarized with the unit's military equipment and weapons and its personnel's everyday life.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov gave a dinner in R. ter Beek's honor.

Ter Beek Holds News Conference

LD2006173190 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—"The Warsaw Treaty Organisation no longer poses any military threat," members of a visiting Dutch delegation told a news conference here today.

The delegation is led by National Defence Minister Relus ter Beek. He is the first Dutch defence minister to visit the Soviet Union. He believes that his visit has become possible thanks to the rapid changes taking place in Eastern Europe, the Warsaw Treaty and the Soviet Union.

Relus ter Beek stressed the importance of contacts and direct talks on defence matters to promote trust, and added that such contacts worked in favour of universal security in Europe. He also spoke in favour of creating security mechanisms within the framework of the conference on security and cooperation in Europe.

As for the military-political status of a united Germany, Ter Beek admitted that talks with Soviet military leadership had brought out a divergency of views. The Netherlands favours Germany's membership in NATO. At the same time, Ter Beek did not exclude the possibility that a mutually acceptable solution would be found.

Asked about the Dutch government's position on tactical nuclear weapons, ter Beek said that he supported the elimination of short-range nuclear weapons through talks.

He also said that at the latest meeting of the NATO nuclear planning group in Canada, he had proposed removing nuclear artillery from the arsenals, and that his initiative was being considered by the North Atlantic alliance.

Military Delegation Ends Visit to Belgium

LD1606160490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0937 GMT 16 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov]

[Text] Brussels, 16 Jun (TASS)—The visit to Belgium by a delegation from the ground forces of the USSR Armed Forces, headed by Colonel General D.A. Grinkevich, chief of the Ground Forces Main Staff, has come to an end. The delegation was invited by the Belgian Ministry of National Defense within the framework of a plan to develop contacts between the armed forces of the two countries.

The members of the delegation were received by Belgian National Defense Minister Guy Coeme, met representatives of the Supreme Command Staff, and visited a number of Belgian Army troop units.

Latin American & Caribbean

1,000 Nicaraguan 'Contras' Still To Surrender

LD1906215790 Moscow TASS in English 2132 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] United Nations June 20 TASS—Only one thousand Contras are yet to surrender arms and receive an identity card to complete the voluntary demobilisation process under the supervision of the U.N. observer group for Central America.

The aggregate number of the demobilised Contras reached 15,258. Nadia Younes, spokeswoman in the office of the U.N. secretary-general, said on Tuesday.

The surrender of arms has already been completed in three "security zones" which were set up on the country's territory and have now been closed down under an agreement between the government and Contra leaders.

Cuban Writer Cited on Perestroika

PM1106110390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Interview with Miguel Barnet, "popular Havana literateur and ethnographer," by own correspondent A. Moiseyev in Havana in June under the rubric "Interview With a Writer": "The Soul of a Cuban"]

[Excerpts] Havana, Jun—He likes going for walks with an interesting companion and deserted beaches, and he collects everyday stories, which "don't weigh your pockets down and take up any space at home..."

That is how Miguel Barnet, the popular Havana litterateur and ethnographer, describes himself as seen from the outside. [passage omitted]

[Moiseyev] What does Miguel Barnet think of the present-day Soviet Union?

[Barnet] I travel a lot, I visit the United States, Western Europe, and the countries of Latin America. And I see with my own eyes what a huge response Soviet perestroika is evoking throughout the world and how quickly attitudes to your country and to socialism in general are changing. The ideas of the new political thinking are winning more and more supporters, especially one of the concept's main postulates which proclaims that we are all members of a huge family called mankind. I am not an economist or a politician. I do not think I have the right to analyze perestroika when I am a long way from your country. But judging by the information which reaches us, now is a time of large-scale changes in your country, of the profound correction of mistakes made in the past. I do not know what the results of this process will be, but I am convinced that it is essentially positive. Of course, one of the main tasks is the cleansing of the soul and release from sins, and this is like a breath of pure air. This is how I understand glasnost. A great purging of consciousness is happening in your country; truthful, frank information cannot but help the establishment of humanism. [Barnet ends]

Miguel Barnet is indignant at the increasingly frequent efforts of late by unfriendly people to divide our peoples and to spread the poison of mistrust. The hostile voice from the other side of the Straits of Florida claims, for instance, that Moscow is foisting its own culture on Cuba.

[Barnet] I don't have to tell you that such claims are simply laughable; they are as far from the truth as the sky is from the ground. Turn on the radio or television. The airwaves will stun you with the diversity of genres and the number of our national rhythms and melodies. Go out onto the street, go to the theater—and you will hear the same thing. Today our culture is developing in new conditions; as you know, rectification is being carried out in the country—a process of correcting mistakes and eliminating negative tendencies. This process has also enveloped the spiritual and cultural sphere, in which positive changes are taking place. Our union of writers and cultural workers is now led by the young prose writer Abel Prieto, who is not yet even 40. He represents the new generation of Cuban revolutionaries—well educated, noble, with a mass of innovative ideas. On the whole, our art has always had an open form of expression. This is embodied in the specifics of our revolution, but I believe that we in Cuba could become even more frank. This will take time.

We sincerely and fraternally love the Soviet people and have always displayed solidarity with them. You need only remember the huge waiting lines that formed outside blood transfusion stations in Havana as soon as Cubans learned of the terrible natural disaster in Armenia. Literally the whole of Havana, all our people, desired to help the earthquake victims as much as they could. Just one instance, but what an eloquent one! And with what impatience did Cubans await Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's visit here! When the visit took place at the beginning of April last year, the guest was given a welcome that was truly tropical in its warmth. And we all followed the pace of the talks with dogged attention. [Barnet ends]

For all his love for the Soviet people and the USSR, Miguel Barnet considers that to mechanically transfer the experience of perestroika to Cuban reality is absurd. There are many problems on the island of freedom, but by no means all of them are similar to those that exist in our country. Conditions, phases of development, and cultures are different. Cubans, the writer believes, must solve their problems themselves, in the Cuban way, in their own style.

Miguel Barnet is full of creative plans. He complains a little about the lack of time: After all, the situation obliges one to devote great energy to public work. What is more, he is secretary of the Cuban Writers and Artists Union Presidium, which is a special responsibility. [passage omitted]

Cuban Deputy Minister Interviewed on Relations

LD2006171690 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Interview with Cuban First Deputy Minister of Foreign Relations Jose Viera by correspondent Aleksandr Serikov, place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded; Serikov and Viera speak in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Serikov] A lot has been said recently, in both the Soviet press and the Soviet parliament, about the need to renew relations between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Cuba. Comrade Shevardnadze, the USSR foreign minister, has stressed that it is necessary for these relations to be mutually advantageous. What do you think about the need to renew these relations?

[Viera] I think that the 30 years of relations between our countries have been fruitful. Now, however, an opportunity to deepen and expand them has appeared. Thanks to the assistance of the Soviet Union, new industries have appeared in Cuba and we have begun supplying many goods to your country. New goods have appeared now: for example, effective medicines for which you have a great need. Opportunities to establish joint enterprises are opening up and the question of Soviet capital investment in the development of our tourism is being studied. Our achievements in the medical field enable us to treat

in Cuba Soviet children who suffered from the Chernobyl accident, and wounded participants in the war in Afghanistan.

[Serikov] You probably talked about the prospects for cooperation in the international arena during your conversations with your Soviet colleagues. What are they?

[Viera] We confirmed the need to expand and deepen contacts in the political field in the fight for disarmament, for the achievement of universal peace, and for the strengthening of the United Nation's role in settling conflicts. It is especially important to step up the role of the developing countries in solving world problems. Undoubtedly the great powers are making a great contribution toward the cause of peace, but there is also a great part to play for the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and we must not forget that.

Gorbachev, Ecuador's President Exchange Greetings

*LD1706114890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1101 GMT 17 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jun (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the Republic of

Ecuador Rodrigo Borja have exchanged telegrams of congratulations in connection with the 45th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, which fell on 16 June.

Mikhail Gorbachev's telegram stresses that now, when profound positive changes are taking place in the world, the ties between the two countries, based on mutual respect and values common to mankind, are gaining new impetus for their dynamic development for the good of the Soviet and Ecuadorean peoples in the interests of strengthening peace and international cooperation based on equal rights.

Rodrigo Borja, having noted good mutual understanding and cooperation have been established between the peoples and governments of the two countries, spoke in favor of still further strengthening of Soviet-Ecuadorean relations.

There was also an exchange of congratulations on the occasion of the date mentioned between the ministers of foreign affairs of the USSR and Ecuador, Eduard Shevardnadze and Diego Cordovez.

Political & Social

Veteran Describes KGB as Untouched by Reforms

PM2006122190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 90 p 2

[Interview with Major General O.D. Kalugin, formerly a leader of Soviet intelligence in the United States and one-time chief of the USSR KGB external counterintelligence administration, by I. Sichka and A. Tsatsuyev under the heading "'The KGB Is Not Changing Its Principles Yet...'"—date and place unspecified; first paragraph is introduction; last five paragraphs are postscript by D. Muratov, member of the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial collegium]

[Text] This man is well known in "certain circles." Dossiers on him have been compiled in the CIA, the Intelligence Service, the Directorate for Territorial Oversight, and other intelligence services in the world. Now we are going to make his acquaintance for the first time. Major General Oleg Danilovich Kalugin used to be one of the leaders of Soviet intelligence in the United States and was formerly chief of the USSR KGB's external counterintelligence administration, the PGU [expansion unknown].

[Interviewers] Oleg Danilovich, how does someone get to become a Soviet intelligence resident in the United States?

[Kalugin] I graduated from the Leningrad University Philology Department as an English language specialist. After university, I was recruited to work for the KGB. In 1958 I went on an assignment to Columbia University (in the United States). It was the first postwar Soviet-U.S. exchange, on the wave of the Khrushchev thaw.

[Interviewers] Were you the only KGB associate in that delegation?

[Kalugin] Certainly not. But I would like to warn you right now that instances like this are evidently going to arise during our conversation more than once, and there are situations in which I cannot give figures, names, or specific circumstances. Despite the fact that I am now in the reserve, I am still a professional intelligence worker and have certain obligations to my country and the organization in which I worked. I hope you understand me....

So then. On my return from the United States, I was immediately sent to the Committee for Radio Broadcasting. Then, eight or nine months later, with a Moscow Radio "cover," I went back to New York. For four years, I believe, I successfully combined journalistic and intelligence activity.

[Interviewers] Incidentally, do all our journalists working abroad combine these two forms of activity?

[Kalugin] Of course not. There are not so many KGB members among journalists. It is another matter that

many of them help us by fulfilling some of our requests, so to speak, in an unofficial capacity.... Well, in 1964 I returned to the USSR. It had been decided to replace my "cover" with something more reliable. So, a year later, I returned to the United States with a diplomatic passport as second secretary—and later first secretary—of the Soviet Embassy in Washington. I was Soviet intelligence deputy resident in the United States and, when the resident left, I performed his duties for quite a long time.

[Interviewers] What does a Soviet resident do in the United States?

[Kalugin] I hope you will understand, but at present I can only talk about this in the most general outlines. The responsibilities of a resident include coordinating the work of our agent networks....

[Interviewers] You said "networks"?

[Kalugin] Yes, there are several of them. The KGB Intelligence Administration consists of three main subdivisions: political intelligence, scientific and technical intelligence, and external counterintelligence. Each has its own agent network and its own targets. For example, the targets of external counterintelligence include the CIA, the FBI, the National Security Agency, and so forth. Political intelligence is concerned with the State Department. The resident coordinates the work of all these networks and sorts and analyzes information. After all, in principle the gathering of information and compilation of forecasts on events that could affect our country is the basic task of intelligence. Naturally, this information is not only culled from newspapers. We often obtain this information for money. The KGB budget includes the corresponding class of currency expenditure.

[Interviewers] Did you never have any doubts about the rightness of the cause you were serving during your time in the KGB?

[Kalugin] I must confess that I first had doubts in 1968. I had already become resident by that time. I was sent a telegram from Moscow informing me that Warsaw Pact troops would invade Czechoslovakia the next day. I was directed to prepare for a possible negative reaction, given some minor instructions, and told to inform the ambassador. I was shocked. Our ambassador, Dobrynin, reacted in basically the same way. Also, I had in my possession absolutely reliable documents from American intelligence, the Pentagon, and the State Department confirming that neither the CIA nor any other American departments had had anything to do with the events in Czechoslovakia. What is more, they were even taken aback by the scale of the events. As resident, I had informed my leadership of this before the invasion. But what shocked me most of all was that, when I went on leave to Moscow a year later, I discovered that the KGB leadership had given instructions that my messages should be destroyed and not shown to anyone.

[Interviewers] Judging by the fact that you have agreed to this conversation, that was not the last time you were disillusioned?

[Kalugin] After I finished working as chief of the external counterintelligence administration, I was sent as KGB administration first deputy chief to Leningrad, where I built up a fairly full picture of the workings of state security bodies *inside* the country. And I reached the firm conclusion that if we seriously want to engage in perestroika then we cannot rely on the methods of an organization which has permeated every pore of our social organism and which interferes—at the party's will—in any affairs of state and social life, the economy and culture, science, sport, and religion. There is not one sphere of life free of the KGB's hand or shadow. As far as I am concerned, all talk of a new face for the KGB is nothing more than camouflage at present. I have every reason to assert that the activity of state security bodies is based on the old Stalinist training. Their methods have largely remained what they were 30, even 50 years ago. From the moment they appeared to the present day, state security bodies have fulfilled the functions of political investigation. Only their targets change. First it was the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, then Trotskyites, Zinovyevites, cosmopolitans, nationalists, clerics, Hare Krishna followers, and informal movements, and, finally, the strike committees and new political parties.

[Interviewers] But can you not give us a few more details about the methods used by the KGB with the strike movement, for example?

[Kalugin] Well, the methods are the same as those used by police all over the world. They either recruit someone or send their own agents into the organization, discredit the movement's activists, and ultimately cause it to disintegrate from within. After all, we still actively use the instructions on work with agents that were compiled in the time of Zubatov, chief of the tsar's secret police. This is an amazing document, which takes full account of what we now call the human factor: "If you want to have a good agent, you must show concern for his health and family and help him to advance in the service.... The police officer must be a substitute mother and father to him...."

[Interviewers] Does that kind of work pay?

[Kalugin] There are two categories of nonstaff assistants: the agents, who give the appropriate written undertakings and receive regular remuneration for their work; and trustees, so to speak, who do not have any formal responsibilities to the state security bodies. Their services can be remunerated fairly discreetly—a valuable gift on their birthday, for example, or help in obtaining an apartment....

[Interviewers] As we have gotten onto the subject of the secret police department, as far as we recall its arsenal included not only methods of undermining from within but also the creation of whole organizations working in the necessary direction....

[Kalugin] Do not worry, we have everything in order in this respect too. When amateur rock groups took the Leningrad performing arts by storm at the beginning of the eighties, a rock club was founded in the city on KGB initiative. With one aim: to keep the movement under control and make it manageable.

[Interviewers] Could you tell us whether KGB bodies ever have occasion to experience any material difficulties?

[Kalugin] No, the KGB has never had those problems. I cannot tell you the size of our budget but, believe me, we get as many rubles and dollars from the state treasury as we ask for.

[Interviewers] And who approves the KGB budget?

[Kalugin] The party Central Committee—at top leadership level.

[Interviewers] Are you also barred from telling us how many people work in KGB bodies?

[Kalugin] That is correct, I cannot tell you, but I can say that the KGB is vast and totally out of proportion to the level of external danger or the degree of the threat to state security inside the country. As far as I am aware, far more people work in just the central apparatus in Moscow than in the entire CIA and FBI system put together.

[Interviewers] Is it true that the KGB has compiled dossiers on virtually everyone?

[Kalugin] The word dossier is a term used in spy movies. But it is true that there are documents on millions of Soviet and foreign citizens. They are grouped into certain "files." I could list a good 100 people known throughout the country on whom such "documents" have been compiled. This practice began in 1918.

[Interviewers] Does the KGB tap telephone conversations?

[Kalugin] That is prohibited by law. But, as first deputy chief of the Leningrad KGB, I could sanction the tapping of any telephone. But I must point out that this is rather a costly undertaking.

[Interviewers] But could anyone—an oblast party committee, for example—ask the KGB to tap someone's telephone?

[Kalugin] The secretary of the Leningrad Oblast party committee once approached me with that kind of request. I refused at the time. But I cannot rule out the possibility that steps might be taken in other places....

[Interviewers] Does the practice of assassination exist in the KGB?

[Kalugin] I do not know how the situation stands now, but the practice still existed a little while ago.

[Interviewers] Forgive us for such a direct question, but did you ever have to implement or plan such operations while you were resident?

[Kalugin] I just knew about them....

[Interviewers] Could you tell us whether there are zones in our country that are closed even to the KGB?

[Kalugin] I am only aware of one such zone: The KGB is not permitted to collect and store any negative information on nomenklatura personnel. When I was working in Leningrad, for example, I had a special list of these people: the secretaries of the oblast party committee, the chairman of the Leningrad city soviet and his deputies, and even the secretaries of the oblast Komsomol committee appeared to be included. In short, all the ruling elite....

[Interviewers] From whom did this ban come?

[Kalugin] I think I have already mentioned in our talk that the only organization which can give any instructions to the KGB is the party Central Committee. In this case I do not know the exact name of the relevant document signed on Staraya Square—a secret instruction or confidential resolution—but in the KGB it was turned into an official instruction. They said there—I shall try to reproduce this from memory—that it was forbidden to conduct any operational measures against... And there followed a list of officials. Then: In the event of receiving adverse materials with regard to these people, these materials should be destroyed immediately on the spot. The same was to be done if such material reached us by indirect means. For instance, if a tape of a bugged telephone conversation happened to contain even a mention of such a person, the place on the tape had to be wiped immediately. That is why I was very amused to read a report from the USSR Prosecutor's Office that it had conducted a further check on the statements of Gdlyan and Ivanov about high-ranking bribe-takers and did not discover any corroborating material. In fact it could not have discovered such material; it simply does not exist in nature. N.S. Khrushchev once stated that the organs had gotten above the party and this was intolerable. True, but with one small amplification. Since then it is not the party but merely its leading apparatus which has been removed from the control of the organs.

[Interviewers] Does the KGB use those forms of work with political opponents which you mentioned with regard to the present deputies' corps?

[Kalugin] When it is a case of structures in opposition to the CPSU, here at least until recently all restrictions were lifted. No matter whether it is the interregional deputies' group or some informal youth organization. No matter what kind of a person is involved: a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet or an ordinary collective farm member. The entire available arsenal, everything which could discredit and blacken the people who do not behave as one would like, can be put into play. I do not

even mention the discrediting of Yeltsin and Gdlyan. Not long before the first USSR People's Deputies Congress at a closed conference in the KGB the leadership gave direct instructions on this subject...

[Interviewers] Is it true that there is a special subunit in the KGB which engages in the dissemination of disinformation?

[Kalugin] Yes, there is indeed such a subunit. It is this subunit which engages in discrediting individual people and organizations and in disseminating anonymous leaflets and false rumors. For instance, materials are collected for a particular story and are leaked to a Western correspondent, and then we read this material in our newspapers citing foreign press organs.

[Interviewers] What is your opinion of the KGB's role in the destruction of the ANT [Automated Equipment-Technology-Science]?

[Kalugin] The KGB did quite a lot to promote the emergence and consolidation of the ANT, after all, it has healthy forces concerned for the country's interests, and at the same time—a paradoxical situation—it became its grave-digger. There is no doubt that the ANT's exposure was inspired by the organs. I personally see two options here. Either it was the result of lack of coordination or of rivalry between different subunits within the KGB, which is extremely unlikely, or, most likely, opposing political forces are involved here. You know at what a high level the ANT's activity was sanctioned, and now consider what level there has to be to allow the KGB to be involved in halting this activity. As a result the government was tripped up and the country is failing to receive imported goods worth 35 billion rubles. That is the price of political games for you.

[Interviewers] In your opinion, how should the KGB be reformed?

[Kalugin] First of all it must be depoliticized. State security must—and will—engage in its own business: defending the Constitution and the stability of the state system and citizens' safety. But when the KGB like, indeed, any other police, begins to worm its way into politics, it invariably becomes an instrument in the hands of various groups and parties.

[Interviewers] And in conclusion, can you predict what the results of this publication will be for you personally?

[Kalugin] There is no doubt that unpleasantnesses await me. Of what kind I cannot yet say...

[Interviewers] Surely, with your experience, it is not that difficult to predict?

[Kalugin] You know, this organization is quite creative and inventive... But I have not exhausted my potential either. [interview ends]

Instead of a Postscript

Our interlocutor was sitting in an editorial room swamped with letters and we spent several consecutive hours asking him questions, removing used batteries from the tape recorder. We had long felt the need for such an interlocutor. Yes, we had tried to defend (and had defended) a boy who was expelled from the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League and given a hard time in the army because a "trusty"—a photographic studio receptionist—had reported to "the appropriate authorities" that on a photograph they had developed he had appeared "as a punk"—that was in 1988. In Baku we found a television center power engineer who told us that the catering bloc might not have been blown up by "extremists"—that was in 1990. We have frequently spoken, even before the 19th party conference, of the need to depoliticize the law enforcement organs. But uncoordinated facts and information which sometimes seeps through have this time been confirmed indirectly or directly by a professional. A recognized professional with his own viewpoint, which obviously will be disputed but, let us hope, also by professionals and not by people with the single grim argument: "You are driving a wedge between the organs and the people."

The system of social fear has entered the system of "social security." We realized that we depended not only on the legal law but also on the retired regular officer, on "objective data," on an opinion which had not been voiced aloud by anyone but which was hanging in the air. A "personal case" was not personal and our actions—it was supposed—might not be assessed but "prevented" before they were accomplished, although they had no bearing on the RSFSR Criminal Code.

An intelligent man once said: "Society has the right to demand from its members the level of boldness whose safety can be ensured." Under a system of hidden but tangible control, the level of boldness per capita, the level of boldness of thought and conduct, could only be wretched. It was a paradox that there was a feeling not of safety but of fear from the existence somewhere close at hand of the living, breathing mmachine of the "organs."

Our interlocutor did not cite names or figures for publication. We understood—he is proceeding from the country's interests. Just as he is proceeding from the country's interests in exposing the system which is preventing the creation of a civil society. On the day we were listening to the general, the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies adopted as its basis the "Decree on Power," which states: "In the RSFSR a system of party-political leadership is not allowed... in the law enforcement organs, the KGB..." The decree is not a Constitution but there is already the hope that society may demand a different level of boldness from its citizens...

D. Muratov, member of the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA editorial collegium.

Dispute Seen Over Freedom of Association Bill

LD2006153790 Moscow TASS in English 1502 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—A bill on public associations (freedom of associations), that differs from the one the Soviet parliament approved in its first reading on May 30, was discussed here today by deputies and representatives of the public. The new bill was submitted by people's deputy Sergey Stankevich (recently elected deputy chairman of the Moscow City Council) and two Moscow lawyers Sergey Soldatov and Mikhail Fedotov.

Stankevich pointed out that the "nucleus" of his bill had been incorporated in the draft approved by the parliament. The two variants create a legal basis for forming a multi-party political system by guaranteeing Soviet citizens the right to join alliances and parties without hindrances. At the same time, the bill envisages a ban on associations aiming to change the country's constitutional system by violent means, disrupt the territorial integrity of the Soviet Union, Union and autonomous republics, incite social, inter-ethnic or religious strife and commit actions contravening the law.

Nevertheless, no agreement was reached on a number of points. The main point disputed is that of relations between the state and public organisations. The bill approved by the parliament gives the right of public organisation membership to state organisations, regarded as collective members. The authors of the second bill are categorically against this rule. Stankevich is sure that it will enable the state to control the activity of public organisations.

Some of the delegates and representatives of various parties and movements disagreed with Stankevich. People's Deputy Andrey Sharonov (Ufa), for instance, said that the rule of the official bill is sufficiently flexible. A downright ban of public organisation membership for the state would be undemocratic.

Other delegates stressed that they saw no essential differences between the first and the second bill.

The parliament is due to settle all disputed issues when its next regular session opens on September 3 to discuss and approve the bill on an article-by-article basis.

Government Approves Joint-Stock Regulations

LD2006221190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 20 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The USSR Government has approved the regulations on joint-stock companies and securities.

These documents envisage the procedure for setting up joint-stock companies whereby no one is entitled to

refuse to register them if the shareholders themselves see the advisability of joint management. This issuing of shares of various kinds has been permitted, including such as are made available by companies on an open subscription basis.

This report will be published in full in the press.

Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress

Medvedev Chairs Draft Session

PM2006143090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "On a Constructive Basis"]

[Text] The third session of the working party of the commission to prepare for the party forum took place 18 June.

It was held under the chairmanship of V.A. Medvedev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with the participation of a large number of congress delegates swelling the ranks of the working party. The version of the document "Toward a Humane, Democratic Socialism" which is under examination, the CPSU Central Committee secretary noted, takes into account the recommendations of the previous session and numerous comments and proposals received from 28th congress delegates, party committees, primary party organizations, and ordinary communists, and also from representatives of the Democratic and Marxist Platforms within the CPSU, with whom working meetings were held. The exposition of principled assessments of the present moment and long-term objectives is now more fully combined with the CPSU's concrete program of action. The text of the document has become more concise.

Taking part in the discussion that developed at the session were L.N. Zaykov, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.N. Senkov, first secretary of Leninskiy CPSU Raykom [rayon committee] (Moscow); A.M. Bogatov, sector chief at the "Etalon" All-Union Scientific Research Institute (Democratic Platform within the CPSU); V.A. Yadov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociology Institute; V.V. Chikin, secretary of the Minsk Clocks and Watches Plant party committee; A.S. Kapto, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department; S.I. Goryushkin, secretary of the Moscow "Mikoyan" Plant party committee; V.D. Popov, chief editor of the journal DIALOG; A.A. Prigarin, director of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems All-Union Scientific Center for the Organization of Labor (Marxist Platform within the CPSU); G.V. Kozlov, laboratory chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of General Physics; A.Ye. Fedotov, deputy chief of the scientific engineering center at the Moscow "Vladimir Ilich" Electrical Equipment Plant; V.A. Nikonov, sector chief at the CPSU Central Committee Ideology Department; A.S. Isayev, chief of the USSR Ministry of the

Aviation Industry Scientific Research Institute of Economics, Planning, and Management; V.N. Kudryavtsev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Yu.N. Shogin, first secretary of Zhukovskiy CPSU Gorkom [city committee] (Moscow Oblast); A.V. Magon, secretary of the Timber Technology Institute party committee (Mytishchinskiy Rayon, Moscow Oblast); Yu.M. Zabrodin, prorector of the Moscow V.I. Lenin State Pedagogical Institute and president of the USSR Psychologists' Society; S.N. Lavrentyev, secretary of the Bashkirian State University party committee; and N.A. Zolotarev, leader of a group of consultants at the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department.

The participants in the discussion focused their attention on three groups of questions: the crisis in society and the party's strategic goals; the party's program of action, including priority, emergency measures and the strategy and tactics for progress toward a humane, democratic socialism; and the party's role in society and its radical democratization.

The need was stressed for a more accurate analysis of the objective and subjective causes of the present situation and the historical roots of the crisis and the mistakes made in the course of perestroika thus far. The participants in the debate said that in examining the distribution of political forces in the country it is necessary to make more careful evaluations of various sociopolitical currents, and they stressed the importance of the CPSU's role as a consolidating force.

Questions of the attitude to various forms of ownership, including state, collective, joint-stock, and private, were the subject of animated discussion. Particular attention was devoted to reflecting in the document guarantees of the implementation of social justice and social protection of working people.

The discussion of the paths of radical perestroika within the party revealed a rapprochement in the understanding of the principles of party structure and its functions and methods of work, and at the same time serious differences of views on these questions among representatives of various platforms within the CPSU.

The opinion was expressed at the session that it is expedient to familiarize the 28th CPSU Congress delegates with the variant draft of the program document, and also to prepare material—before the congress begins—reflecting the main differences between the platforms within the CPSU.

A procedure was defined for the working party's activity in the final stages of preparation of the draft program document for the 28th party congress.

Delegates Meet Central Committee

PM2006105490 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[A. Ilin, V. Kozhemayko report: "Frank Talk About Urgent Matters: Meetings Between Delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the Russian Party Conference With Leaders of the Party Central Committee"]

[Text] The future of our party, our country. It persistently concerns every one of us now, prompting profound thoughts and serious concern, hopes for a speedy end to the crisis situation, and anxiety over the fact that there is still too much that hampers the fulfillment of our aspirations.

The delegates to the 28th party congress who are participating in the Russian Party Conference that opens today brought to Moscow thousands of pressing questions that trouble people's minds and souls. The crisis in the party—how can it be overcome? Are there ways of consolidating the party's ranks, or is a split inevitable, as some people predict? What part could and should be played by the formation of a Russian Communist Party within the CPSU?

A great many pressing problems are to be tackled by the Russian Party Conference delegates. Tackled jointly, in the course of a creative, collective discussion. Without disregarding anyone's opinions, even if they do differ from the generally accepted view. Without glossing over contradictions and doubts, but carefully considering every step. This discussion can be said to have begun already. The delegates, meeting at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, where registration was in progress, at the CPSU Central Committee, and in the "Rossiya" Hotel, where they were settling in, used every opportunity to exchange opinions, tell each other about the thoughts that concern them, and debate matters. The path to the truth is not easy—often, as we know, truth is born out of dispute. The desire to consult with someone authoritative who has more extensive information at his disposal is also natural.

Perhaps it was mainly this desire that dictated the meetings organized at the delegates' request with leaders of the party Central Committee. L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, A.N. Yakovlev, O.D. Baklanov, Ye.S. Stroyev, G.I. Usmanov, and I.T. Frolov took part in the discussions.

What should be noted in particular? The atmosphere of the utmost frankness which marked these meetings on both sides. The Central Committee leaders willingly engaged in sincere discussions of everything that was of interest to the delegates. And the representatives of Russia's party organizations, having received the trust of their comrades, did not shrink from posing the most pressing, sometimes even trenchant questions. Among these questions were some, so to speak, global questions touching on the interests of the whole party, as well as

problems of so-called local significance and even problems on a personal level. People inquired about the position of the Central Committee leadership on concrete problems of perestroika and the attitude to the forthcoming radical reform of the economy.

"What do you mean by the words 'renewal of the party'? A total change of leadership, or something else? Gul'dyayev, from Barnaul."

"In many ways the decline in the party's prestige is furthered by one-sided information from dubious mass media on supposed abuses of power and official position by a number of leaders of our country and party. At the same time no counterarguments are published. And we are left in ignorance as to whether or not this is so. Why do you, as a CPSU Central Committee secretary and chief editor, not demand truthful information on these complaints? What is your position on this point? S.N. Lyubimov, of the Kemerovo delegation."

"What party publications is it proposed to hand over to the Russian Communist Party? Has the question of transferring part of the CPSU Central Committee's property to the future Russian Communist Party Central Committee been examined? What level of compromise was achieved at the 'Democratic Platform' conference held on 15-16 June? L.A. Ponkrat'yev, from Omsk."

"Did the Central Committee know about the possibility of nationalist actions in the republics? If so, why were measures not adopted to nip them in the bud? Pevtsov, from the Kuzbass."

"Unfortunately you are not managing to put into practice your ideas about goodness and love toward people, the common human ideals. Dark forces of dissatisfaction and ignorance will sweep away you and your supporters yet again... S.N. Avdoshkin, from Altay Kray."

"At oblast (kray) and rayon level the soviets and the party have a single press organ. What do you think will happen in future in this respect?"

"Today's issue of PRAVDA publishes an article by a regular author, Kondyryn, a party worker from Gorkiy Oblast, under the rubric 'Individual Opinion.' He expresses doubts as to the expediency of setting up a republic communist party. Yet until recently this was the opinion of the majority, and there were many arguments for it. Is the PRAVDA editorial collegium not being rather hasty in sinking to the level of the common view and relegating this opinion to the place of an 'individual' view? The question of setting up a communist party or a republic party organization is the main question that has to be resolved by us conference delegates tomorrow. What is your opinion on this problem, as a communist? V.F. Draskov, Altay Kray, first secretary of Pavlovskiy Rayon CPSU Committee."

Notice that this memorandum and a number of others contain the persistent question: "What is your opinion? Your position?" There is, of course, nothing remarkable

about that. People want to know personal attitudes to a given problem. And this entirely natural curiosity was, it must be said, fully satisfied. Although sometimes the request for people to express their opinions was more like a demand to prescribe a formula. For instance, who should be elected first secretary of the future Russian Communist Party Central Committee? Or whose organ should PRAVDA become—that of the whole party, or, as before, that of the CPSU Central Committee?

Incidentally, there was a particularly large number of questions about PRAVDA at the meeting we attended. In their remarks the delegates noted that the newspaper has recently changed markedly for the better and become more democratic and open for the presentation of different opinions, while the pregress "Discussion Sheet" has won wide popularity. There were also criticisms and suggestions for the newspaper—that it should always be accurate and truthful; while publishing diverse opinions, it should make its own position clear; more attention should be devoted to questions of the theory of perestroika; there should be more reliance on the opinions not only of Muscovites and Leningraders, as often happens, but also of communists from other parts of the country... Well, the PRAVDA editorial collective will certainly try to take into account the voice of such authoritative readers as the delegates to the congress and conference.

Marxist Platform Group Meets

PM2106091290 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by A. Buzgalin, member of the Coordinating Council of the Movement of Supporters of the Marxist Platform in the CPSU: "Conference of Supporters of the Marxist Platform"]

[Text] The second conference of the Movement of Supporters of the Marxist Platform in the CPSU was held in Moscow 16 and 17 June. Taking part were representatives of communists from six Union republics and dozens of cities in the Union. The meeting was of the nature of a business conference on the eve of the Russian Party Conference and the 28th CPSU Congress.

An alternative draft of the basic guidelines for an anticrisis program was discussed. The document cites the view that the program should not be a mixture of the free market and bureaucratic regulation, so that reforms would be implemented from above and at the people's expense, but should draw on the working people's initiative and self-organization and not allow a reduction in their real standard of living.

The most urgent steps in such a program would be: price monitoring by mass democratic organizations of working people, such as a consumers' union, with the help of the state, so as to ensure that price reform does not lead to a general increase in prices; the implementation of supply rationing on a territorial basis—openly, in a spirit of glasnost, and under the control of local

self-government organs; the development of self-government as the real basis of the worker's position as the master in production, and other measures enabling the people to organize to defend their own interests.

The draft also covers the most important aspects of the resolution of the strategic problem of forming a new economic mechanism, making provision for social, democratic management of the market, as well as the formulation and implementation of long-term programs for radical structural perestroika in the economy in favor of spheres ensuring the free, all-around development of the individual and a fitting living standard for him.

A resolution on the draft CPSU Statutes proposed by the Central Committee stresses that on a number of points the document is still undemocratic.

It was stressed that one condition for regaining the people's confidence in the party is to publicly cleanse its ranks of people who discredited themselves in the past through corruption and bureaucratic methods of work.

Among other congress documents is a message to the president demanding a ban on the holding of a meeting of veterans of the SS division in the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic and the dispersal of pro-fascist organizations.

The conference submitted a proposal to the congress to reconstitute the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism as a partywide scientific center.

Democratic Platform on Demands

PM2106092990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 90 Second Edition p3

[Yu. Makhurin report: "Conference Concludes Work"]

[Text] Moscow—The second all-Union conference of the "Democratic Platform Within the CPSU," held in Moscow's "Oktyabr" Movie and Concert Hall, lasted two days. It completed its work on 17 June.

A total of 877 delegates (including 54 nonparty people) from 12 Union republics took part in the conference. They included 40 delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress, 18 USSR people's deputies, and 59 workers.

The conference discussed the political situation in the CPSU on the eve of the 28th congress and the Russian party conference and drafted a common platform on participation in these party forums.

The conference participants discussed three reports, delivered by V. Lysenko, V. Shostakovskiy, and I. Chubays. The leitmotiv of their speeches was that it is impossible to radically reform the CPSU and that the organizational basis of this totalitarian party must be dismantled. At the same time, two different viewpoints are evident in the tactics for action. I. Chubays believes that no time must be lost and that an organizational committee should be set up right now to organize a new, alternative party to the CPSU. The two other speakers

believe that the "Democratic Platform" must go to the 28th congress and the Russian party conference, but with its own package of documents containing proposals for the transformation of the CPSU and the creation of a new party in Russia—of the parliamentary democratic type. The conference approved this idea and proposed renouncing the old basis of the CPSU.

What are they actually renouncing? In an interview with your PRAVDA correspondent, V. Lysenko enumerated the following: the communist idea as the goal of the CPSU; the monopoly of one ideology; democratic centralism; territorial-production and unitary principles of building; the nomenklatura system; and the old, compromised name—the Communist Party.

And on what basis is it intended to found the new party (the conference participants intend to proclaim these principles later, at the congress)? The main principles are as follows: common human interests and values; individual rights and freedoms; all the wealth of democratic, socialist thought; broad intraparty pluralism; and recognition of the supremacy of the law and the will of the electorate.

An appeal to delegates to the 28th congress and the Russian party conference says: "It is our profound belief that the interests of rallying the majority of the republic's population will be met by founding a party of the parliamentary type, based on democratic values, which works in accord with the USSR Constitution and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution, strives for the right to political leadership exclusively through elections and in honest struggle with other political parties, relies in its activity on the mass democratic movement, and supports democratic factions in soviets at all levels. In order to win authority among the citizens of the RSFSR and the entire country, it must be a party that is in favor of reviving Russian statehood in the form of a sovereign, democratic republic and that is based on the priority of common human interests and values, equality for all forms of ownership and a regulated market economy, and the principles of humanism, pluralism, social protection for citizens, and interethnic accord."

The conference proposes that the Russian Party Conference be held as a preparatory conference for the constituent congress of a party of RSFSR communists; that the opportunity be taken to discuss the basic concepts for founding a new party and to elect an organizational committee on parity principles (from representatives of various platforms); and that an all-Russia party referendum be held after the 28th CPSU Congress—which will determine the future of the Communist Party and the entire Soviet Union—so that Russian communists can themselves decide what kind of party they want to create.

The conference decided to transform the "Democratic Platform Within the CPSU" into a federative structure. It elected a Coordination Council. It adopted a program

statement and also several resolutions. One of them—a general political resolution—inter alia discusses the permissible limits of compromise at the 28th congress, lists what should be renounced, and makes the following demand: "In the event of these principles' being rejected, work should be started to found a new political party on the basis of the 'Democratic Platform' draft program statement and statute."

Co-op Council Nominates Delegates

PM2106091190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Program Discussed"]

[Text] Questions pertaining to the activities of the USSR Consumer Cooperatives and the elaboration of a program for their work in conditions of a regulated market economy were discussed at a meeting of the Central Union of Consumer Cooperatives Council.

To replace a departing deputy, the council nominated S. Litvinenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Union of Consumer Cooperatives Board, and G. Zamytskaya, chairman of the State Trade and Consumer Cooperative Workers Union Central Committee Presidium, as candidate USSR People's Deputies from the USSR Union of Consumer Cooperatives.

Reconstituted Union Cannot Be 'Patchwork State'

PM2006113590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the general heading: "Press Center Briefing"]

[Text] **How Are We To Build Our Union?**

Will the structure of our state change in the near future? There was a lively discussion of this topical question at the press center for the 28th CPSU Congress and the Russian party conference, where Soviet and foreign journalists met with G.I. Revenko, member of the USSR Presidential Council.

Our society is on the verge of implementing the most important part of the political reform, the speaker said. There is effectively to be a new structure for the Union. The democratization process that is developing in the course of perestroika has made the question of interethnic relations a top priority. People's desire to improve their national system is quite justified and timely. Their aspirations fall within the mainstream of perestroika ideas.

But a union of sovereign socialist states must be shaped with consideration for the republics' features. The principle of a voluntary union of peoples is to be the foundation of our society. Priority must be given in this process to human rights and freedoms. G.I. Revenko pointed out that it is particularly important to take this into account because approximately 60 million citizens

in our country now live outside their national formations. Another indispensable condition for the formation of a new state structure is the following: No lasting alliance can exist as long as there are still strong vertical management structures. The introduction of a regulated market economy must bring them into line with the demands of the political moment.

These questions, the USSR Presidential Council member said, were discussed extensively at a recent sitting of the Council of the Federation, where numerous proposals put by representatives of the Union republics were taken into consideration. It was particularly noted that we cannot form a "patchwork state." So, the new structure must be based on a unified constitutional foundation.

Ligachev on Market Economy, Land Ownership

PM1806140090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Ye.K. Ligachev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the Central Committee Commission for Agrarian Policy, by correspondent O. Stepanenko; date, place of interview not stated: "I Believe in the People's Soul and Reason"—first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] At the moment, as we approach the Russian Communist Party conference and the 28th CPSU Congress, there is great interest in the main avenues of the party's agrarian policy. The editorial mail is evidence of this. The letters pose numerous questions connected not only with the socioeconomic situation in our agriculture, but also with the political evaluation of what is happening in the countryside. Many of these questions are addressed to Ye.K. Ligachev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the Central Committee Commission for Agrarian Policy. Readers want to know, in particular, how the CPSU Central Committee regards the fact of the formation of the USSR Peasants' Union and what his personal opinion is of the new sociopolitical organization and its role in the complex processes taking place in the countryside. And whether his trip to Sweden, which took place not long before the peasants' congress, is associated with the intention of making adjustments to agrarian policy and turning still more in the direction of the private farming system in agriculture. Our correspondent asked Ye.K. Ligachev to answer these questions.

[Stepanenko] It would clearly be useful to begin with our "domestic" event—the formation of the Peasants' Union.

[Ligachev] Indisputably. I expressed my attitude to it at the union's congress. I think you will agree: A fundamentally new sociopolitical organization has been set up in the country, uniting an entire class—the peasantry class. Together with that part of the working class and intelligentsia that works in the agro-industrial complex. This organization is destined to strengthen and develop. If we

had had such an agrarian union before, I am confident that we would have made fewer mistakes with regard to peasants, the countryside, and agriculture as a whole.

[Stepanenko] Different opinions exist on why the union was set up and what its purpose is.

[Ligachev] I think it was set up because the peasantry's role in society has increased. It has undergone politicization and the need to defend its interests is more keenly felt than ever before. And of course, the formation of the union is primarily associated with the rapid and, let me be frank, contradictory processes of democratization of our society. The peasantry, like the working class, is very concerned about the fact that it is poorly represented in the highest organs of power.

[Stepanenko] Incidentally, that is one of the biggest notes of alarm in our mail. Democratization has led to the estrangement of the working people from management. And at the most fundamental, basic level—in the structure of the organs of legislative and executive power. The way there proved to be barred to workers and peasants to such an extent that there are literally only isolated individuals representing them among the deputies to the union and republic parliaments.

[Ligachev] Unfortunately, you are right. I will say nothing about the parliaments. Even at party congresses and conferences workers and peasants are poorly represented. The elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress have now taken place, and fewer than 15 percent of them are people who work on the land or at the machine tools. The peasantry and working class naturally want to set up true democratization in the interests of the working people in contrast to this kind of democratization. They therefore seek access to real political activity. The purpose of the Peasants' Union, it seems to me, is to represent the economic and social interests of the peasantry and workers in the agro-industrial complex in society and in our state system and to promote in every way the development of a cooperative movement based on social ownership of the means of production. I think it has a great role to play in the development of economic and political ties between the city and the countryside and the strengthening of the alliance of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia.

I will not deny that I was most gratified by the fact that despite the difficult processes unleashed by the very first steps toward the market system—the increasing costs of industrial output and industrial services—the Peasants' Union did not enter into confrontation with the working class. That it was firmly declared at the union's congress that the countryside and city are a single whole and that the conflicts between them, created in past years and greatly strengthened in the context of the transition to market relations, must be eliminated. It was gratifying that the Peasants' Union sees the only solution in the unity of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia.

[Stepanenko] Yegor Kuzmich, what, in your view, should the attitude of the CPSU and the communists to the agrarian union be?

[Ligachev] I would like to divide the question into two parts. First—what is the attitude of the peasantry itself to the Communist Party. I think the vast majority of our peasantry supports the party and is on its side. Second—I am convinced that rural communists will join the agrarian union, set about working, win over the masses, and strengthen the party's prestige. I repeat—win over the masses, which is very important in the period of an incipient multiparty system. I hope the Peasants' Union will help the party to strengthen its influence among the rural population: After all, this union is a powerful force consolidating the peasantry. I personally would advise party committees actively to help it to find its feet, so to speak, to form the corresponding organizations, and to give them every possible assistance.

[Stepanenko] And what is the Central Committee's attitude toward the agrarian union?

[Ligachev] The fact that a Peasants' Union is being set up was discussed at the Politburo and at a session of our agrarian commission. Everyone took a positive view of it. I would also like to mention one of the main questions that was debated at the agrarian congress. The diversity of forms of ownership.

[Stepanenko] I think this question is being debated in society as a whole, not just at the agrarian congress.

[Ligachev] True. Because of the attempts to represent my speech in a certain light, I would like to refresh memories. At the congress I was not talking about forms of ownership in general, but about forms of socialist ownership. That is very important. I said that I am decisively in favor of a diversity of forms of socialist ownership. At the same time I am profoundly convinced that at present and in future the basis of our agriculture will be social ownership (in the form of state and cooperative enterprises) integrated with individual labor ownership (personal plots, family farms). I added that I cannot conceive of the policy of perestroika without continuity. From my viewpoint, this is of fundamental significance.

With regard to the most important question—the choice of forms of economic management—my position amounts to a simple fact of life: This choice should be a purely voluntary and economically valid matter. Here the peasant should have the last word. As for private farming [fermerstvo], I am in favor of it, but on those terms—voluntary and economically valid.

Many of our troubles stem from the fact that our policy does not ensure the necessary combination of transformations and continuity. In particular, the kolkhoz and sovkhoz system has enormous potential for the successful development of production, the economy, and the social sphere in our agriculture. And we are only just beginning to remove administrative edict chains and

fetters so as to release this enormous—I repeat, enormous—economic and moral potential. Many delegates to the agrarian congress spoke of this.

Today only a blind man would fail to see that the Soviet peasantry, which created the union, needs the cooperative system, an extensive cooperative system, and it needs the support of the state and of our union, that is, the Peasants' Union.

[Stepanenko] I believe you were elected to the Peasants' Union Central Council.

[Ligachev] And I regard it as a great honor. I am grateful for this expression of trust and I regard it as an assessment of my position on agrarian questions.

[Stepanenko] Yegor Kuzmich, you said that the choice of forms of economic management should be economically valid. The editorial office is receiving indications that this calls for serious thought. Here is one such indication. In Latvia more than 5,000 private farms [fermerskiye khozyaystva] were formed. They were given credit, but there is nothing to buy: no equipment, no construction materials. They set about making calculations: How many resources are needed? They set up one farm on the basis of imported equipment, another with our own. It turned out that for imported equipment it came to half a million foreign currency rubles, and for our own—480,000 Soviet rubles. Even without the adjustment (which is vast) for convertible currency, it turns out that you need R2.5 billion for 5,000 farms. Yet R390 million a year is invested in the whole of Latvia's agriculture. So the new private farmers need six times more than all the republic's kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The situation is even more striking if you take into account that these farms make up one-forty-third of Latvia's farming units. So does this mean that for one-forty-third you need six times as much as for all the others? That we are looking for an economical option, yet pushing for the most ruinous possible one? What kind of economic validity is this?

[Ligachev] True. Such indications are beginning to come in from various zones of the country, and the Peasants' Union delegates did not ignore this problem. It is now clear to everyone who values the countryside's interests and seeks to get to the bottom of the current processes that the proposals of certain scientists who absolutize the move to private farming (as if this was the only way, and a miraculous way at that) do not contain a scientific prognosis even of the immediate socioeconomic consequences, to say nothing of the longer term. This is economic improvisation founded on isolated premises, the analysis of isolated facts and phenomena, rather than an integral economic system. Whatever form of ownership (collective, private) we choose, we still need modern processing of agricultural raw materials, the provision of equipment for the peasants, and social amenities for them.

[Stepanenko] So why do you, fighter that you are, not approach it head-on, as the saying goes, and come out categorically against yet more delusions and false starts?

[Ligachev] You are not being objective. Or else you are not very well informed. Even from the speeches seen in the press and on television, it is clear that I adhere to a firm stance. It is another matter that perhaps I do not always uphold it with the degree of toughness and argumentation that are needed today. But this is not because I lack resolve or arguments. I simply rely on common sense. I realize now that it is necessary to be even more resolute in clarifying positions and upholding principles. And above all to strip away the accretions and expose the essence of the myths accumulated by certain forces since the start of perestroika.

[Stepanenko] Incidentally, readers express anxiety: No parliament in the world will ever adopt a law under which anyone can just leave an enterprise and take some of its resources with him. Yet our Soviet parliament has done just that. Under the Law on Land everyone, on leaving a sovkhoz, for instance—and a sovkhoz is an enterprise—can take part of the land. Many people note that this is downright anarchy. In a society of free enterprise and "freedom" of the individual, no legislator and no boss would ever tolerate such a thing.

[Ligachev] Well, that is a fair comment. The principle of freedom to the detriment of others is highly dangerous and has already brought mankind to the brink of catastrophe, which was avoided, if you look at it objectively, by socialism, however deformed it may have been. At the macro-level, when large entities, republics, withdraw from a whole community to the detriment of other republics and peoples, we have already realized how ruinous this kind of "freedom" is. And we are working out a mechanism for secession taking everyone's interests into account. Yet at the micro-level, which is the basic foundation of economic and social processes and determines their orientation either toward destruction or toward creation, we are reluctant to grasp it. It was no accident that the Peasants' Union delegates also spoke of the need for economic substantiation when innovations are introduced.

[Stepanenko] Yegor Kuzmich, did the trip to Sweden change your views and your approach to rural problems?

[Ligachev] On the contrary, if anything it reinforced them.

[Stepanenko] Yet Sweden bases its life on private ownership of the means of production, and its agriculture has achieved great successes—on the basis of private farming.

[Ligachev] Who is denying it? But there are many reasons for these successes. The Swedes joke, for instance, not without reason, that Russia, or specifically Peter the Great, helped them a good deal.

[Stepanenko] What do they mean?

[Ligachev] He taught them to fight, and nearly three centuries of peace helped the entire economy to grow strong. But there are, you realize, other reasons too.

[Stepanenko] Please mention at least the main ones briefly.

[Ligachev] We studied questions relating to the development of the cooperative movement in the country and the methods of regulating socioeconomic processes in society. First of all I would like to speak about the cooperative system in the agro-industrial complex. True, we knew this already, but now we have realized particularly keenly that the farmer in that country is not working in isolation. He is simply not capable of working in isolation. Everyone has come together to form appropriate cooperatives. Whoever we met with, the farmers said that they belong to between four and six cooperatives. And that they could not withstand competition from private capital if they did not join together.

Over there, in Sweden, I kept catching myself thinking: The transformation of our kolkhozes and sovkhozes into cooperatives of leaseholding collectives (and these processes are under way) is leading to the strengthening of economic accountability principles and personal interest, and that means efficiency.

[Stepanenko] As I understand it, all cooperatives, all farms over there are united in the National Farmers' Union.

[Ligachev] Right. Let me say at once that they have to work hard, as a rule, 12-14 hours a day, often without time off at the weekend. But they are well equipped with machinery and are socially better off than our peasants. Some figures. In Sweden for every 100 hectares of land there is fixed production capital amounting to a sum of R300,000. As you know, in our country the figure is not much more than 60,000. As for power available per worker, the figure looks like this: On average there is 180-200 horsepower per farmer in Sweden, while here there is 33 horsepower. That is an extremely important point, because for too long we underestimated material, technical, and social factors in the development of the agro-industrial complex.

[Stepanenko] We called ourselves materialists, but really we were idealists and thought that you can get something from nothing?

[Ligachev] Precisely. In Sweden once again we were firmly convinced that along with the type of ownership and the form of economic management, exceptional significance is attached to material, technical, and social factors for development.

I would like to say that the National Farmers' Union has very broad rights. In particular, in the middle of the year its representatives assemble without fail for a "round-table," along with representatives of the consumers, trade unions, and the state. And every year they examine questions relating to purchase prices for agricultural

products and the price correlation between agricultural and industrial output. To ensure that economic equality and price parity are strictly observed.

[Stepanenko] The parity which, for decades, our peasants have been telling us loud and clear has been violated?

[Ligachev] That is bitter for us, but true. This violation alone undermines the countryside at its roots. In Sweden the state strictly regulates purchase prices for such important types of agricultural produce as grain, milk, meat, eggs, and a number of other food products and agricultural raw materials in the light of the interests of rural workers.

The level of social security is also important. There, the farmer has the same pension as a city dweller, and his living conditions are better than the city dweller's.

[Stepanenko] The impression is created that the free market that certain economists propose for us does not exist in Sweden.

[Ligachev] That is not an impression. It is a fact. Those of our esteemed economists who propose so-called free market relations, which will undoubtedly lead to mass unemployment—let them be the first unemployed, let them find out what it means. I am sure that it is possible to create a system of material assistance to the unemployed, but to make up to a capable person for participation in socially useful activity—that is impossible. And there is no greater disaster for anyone than to be discarded from the sphere of social production.

[Stepanenko] How do things stand in Sweden?

[Ligachev] There they have created a regulated market for labor and prices and a system of social protection for working people in the conditions of a market economy. In that country a whole network of 400 employment bureaus for people capable of working has been set up. As well as more than 100 centers for professional reorientation and professional retraining. You can judge for yourself the scale of this system's activity, when last year it found jobs for 530,000 people. That is with a working-age population of only 4 million. In Sweden less resources are spent on grants to unemployed people, and more on setting up professional reorientation and retraining centers, that is, on the prevention of unemployment. In all, unemployment in that country is about 1.5 percent of the working population.

[Stepanenko] I think it is higher here.

[Ligachev] We have some elements of job-finding and professional retraining. Only elements. And unless we create a proper system, in the course of the transition to the planned market economy we will come right up against the terrible phenomenon of mass unemployment.

[Stepanenko] You know, two questions arise here. First—need we imitate Swedish experience entirely? As

one reader writes, warning against this, "they want to make us into Swedes, but can we be Swedes?"

[Ligachev] There can be no question of slavish imitation. Lenin himself criticized Mr. Mikhaylovskiy for his slogan "'Borrow' the good parts from everywhere—and it is in the bag!" The different conditions must be taken into account. There is the incompatibility factor: What suits one system very well is rejected by another. So it is a question of studying approaches and methods.

[Stepanenko] And the second question. Do you not think that in the Swedish experience, at least what you have spoken about, the most important thing is the organization of the struggle against the consequences. The same old capitalist economy, the same old market relations, albeit regulated by the state. But scientific socialism offers different approaches, structures, and principles.

[Ligachev] You are right. In general it provides for the combination of interests and the formation of equal, fair relations, beginning with the most basic levels, the cells of production and of life. And this, let me tell you, accords with the spirit of our people, who have a very keen sense of injustice and inequality. Take the question of ownership of the land. I would like to quote a remark by A.V. Chayanov: "For the people, what matters is not ownership of the land, but that they should have access to the land and that they should not be prevented from working steadily and productively on the land. It also matters to them that the land should not accumulate in the hands of nouveaux riches. Yet when there is private ownership, land slips very easily from the hands of the poorest farmers, and accumulates in the hands of the rich..."

Private ownership of the means of production, in any form, leads to divisions between people and differentiation of their interests. There is nothing innovative in the fact that private ownership is being proposed, all this has happened before. Those who call for a free market invariably push us back, toward private-ownership appropriation of the results of other people's labor, toward its exploitation.

Let us in the end ask the people's opinion on what path we should follow in restructuring society—the socialist or the capitalist path. Let us hold a nationwide referendum.

As for my opinion, I am in favor of a planned market economy based on social ownership of the means of production in all the diversity of its forms. I am in favor of a market guaranteeing firm prices for the main consumer goods and with real guarantees against unemployment. I am in favor of the consistent, gradual, and steady implementation of the socialist reform of society. Gradual—that does not mean slow. It means stage by stage, from one milestone to the next, devoting the maximum time and effort to preparing for the transformations (legal, organizational, and educational preparation).

Once again: I believe in the people's soul and reason. That is what I am taking to the Russian party conference and the party congress.

Primakov Answers Questions on Foreign Policy

*PM2006084990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Unattributed account of discussion between Ye.M. Primakov, member of the Presidential Council and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and international affairs journalists at the PRAVDA editorial office in Moscow on 13 June: "In the Press Club of International Affairs Journalists: The Paths and Future of Changes"—first four paragraphs are an introduction]

[Text] We shall not go into a detailed introduction of Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov. He is member of the Presidential Council, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, scientist, and journalist who has worked for PRAVDA in the past.

He was a guest of the Press Club of International Affairs Journalists, which has been functioning under the newspaper's editorial office since the start of this year. Being a guest of journalists means answering their questions for an hour, or two, or three... He answered, feeling at home in the editorial office. It is a pity that the newspaper's "limitations" do not allow us to reproduce all questions and all answers in full.

We perceive the discussion with Ye.M. Primakov also as part of the series of interviews with the country's political leadership under the "Precongress Meetings" rubric.

I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and PRAVDA chief editor, took part in the meeting. And so, questions and answers.

[Unidentified questioner] Esteemed Yevgeniy Maksimovich, you have only just returned from the United States, where the summit meeting took place. Yes, assessments have been made and emphasis placed accordingly. Nonetheless, how would you comment on the results of the talks? What foreign policy tasks were solved by M.S. Gorbachev's visit?

[Primakov] I would like to mention several aspects which determine the present situation. The new political thinking in foreign policy, as you know perfectly well, has demolished the prevailing stereotype in the West. Namely that the Soviet Union, like a brown bear, is looming over the world in pursuit of its hegemonic interests. That was the stereotype of a permanent adversary, an enemy. It is no longer in existence.

At the same time, the West's ideas about us are still wavering. I must note that public opinion in the West proved unprepared for the complex processes which got under way in the Soviet Union in the time of perestroika. In my view, after a certain period of euphoria,

the barometer of Western public opinion is shifting toward "restraint." This is first.

Second. Shifts in public opinion and the leaning toward "restraint" influence statesmen in their attitudes toward the USSR. This must be taken into account. This applies even to realistically minded politicians who, at the very outset of perestroika, generally banked on normalization of relations with us. Their scope for maneuver is being somewhat curtailed. It was fine while public opinion was, on the whole, sufficiently unambiguous in our favor, but it is a different matter now that different shades of opinion have started emerging.

Third. We are facing a more complex situation as a result of changes in East Europe. The Warsaw Pact as a military organizations is, to all intents and purposes, questionable. Germany's unification is proceeding at a pace that would have been difficult to foresee... The United States, by dint of present circumstances in East Europe, stands of the threshold of changing attitudes in its global strategy. Of course, this is not a matter of abandoning the line adopted in the last few years, but rather of a possible shift of emphasis. This must also be very clearly understood. Bearing all this in mind, it became even more important to prevent an interruption of the consistent process of arms reductions, to verify and align positions with the United States on problems concerning the military-political aspects of Germany's unification in view of the fact this is largely the key to accords on this issue with Britain, France, and the FRG. Naturally, with total understanding of their own role. It became especially important to try and achieve two new "breakthroughs" in Soviet-U.S. relations. The first concerns the extension of these relations and collaboration in new spheres, primarily the economy. The second concerns cooperation targeted on the elimination of regional conflicts. It is necessary to also mention the need to stabilize public opinion on a "properestroika" basis.

It was these foreign policy tasks that were borne in mind during President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States. The visit's results are known from published material and the president's report to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

S. Morozov (ZA RUBEZHOM): Where did questions associated with Lithuania and the Baltic region figure in the discussions?

Ye. Primakov: The main point to be made is this: From my point of view, Bush took a definite stance. And he did so in conditions when, one could say, a certain "sandwich" has developed in the United States. On the one hand you have the people who do not support any hardline separatism. Americans place relations with the Soviet Union much higher on the scale of values, they have no wish to disrupt the process of democratization now under way in the Soviet Union. In this case, public opinion coincides with the administration's stance. Between them you have Congress which has taken a

different stance. This is mainly the effect of the forthcoming November elections, coupled with energetic activeness by emigre elements.

Proof of the U.S. President's stance is offered by the following important fact: During the press conference, when he came under attack on this issue, he virtually linked the trade agreement with the law on travel. He refused to link it with Lithuania.

V. Korzin (State Television and Radio): In your opinion, to what extent can the stance of Congress, which really differs from the President's stance, have a long-term effect on mutual relations with the Soviet Union?

Ye. Primakov: Naturally, I can only express my own appraisal of the situation. It seems to me that this stance by Congress will not remain for long in its present shape.

Look, just before I came here I specially wrote down the results of an opinion poll conducted by THE BOSTON GLOBE. Some 80 percent opined that the summit meeting was successful, 66 percent that the Bush administration is pursuing a correct line in mutual relations with the Soviet Union. Bush's popularity stood at 70 percent before the meeting, rising to 81 percent after it. This indicates that public opinion supports the administration's course. This could be seen at first hand even by those who were present there.

I think that—especially following the latest sitting of the Council of the Federation—we will see serious changes in our own country which will render the situation less acute.

G. Vasilyev (PRAVDA): I would like to ask a general question. What do you think, is it appropriate to say that our relations with the United States are at a watershed, that we are approaching new relations based not on ideological rivalry but on consideration of the balance of interests?

Ye. Primakov: I think so. Generally speaking, there are sphere in which our relations are switching to the standard of relations which the United States, despite all the contradictions, enjoys with Japan, for example, or the FRG. There are, of course, more elements in common there. The nature of society and the history of the confrontation with us have their effect. At the same time, however, I got the impression that we are now beginning to discover a field of coincident interests in relations with the United States, we are trying to build them up. We have departed from the point where both sides used to say: "Here is the main adversary, it is necessary to prepare for confrontation, for a clash." We are moving away from this at a fast enough speed. There will, of course, be recurrences of the past, there will be zigzags. This will happen because nothing in life moves as smoothly as traffic along Nevskiy Prospekt.

B. Averchenko (PRAVDA): PRAVDA receives very many letters in which readers accuse us Soviet communists, who set an example of revolutionary transformations beginning with the Great October, of having abandoned our communist friends in East European countries to their fate.

Ye. Primakov: Yes, this is a major question which perturbs us. We perceive and comprehend the difficulties being experienced by communists in East European countries today. Each country has its own difficulties. But life is such that the ruling parties, having lost the confidence of the masses, have found themselves (with the exception of Bulgaria) in opposition or have reformed themselves into new parties. Nor can we overlook instances when some leaders of these parties are undeservedly accused even of "sins" they have not committed. E. Honecker, for example, was charged with criminal offenses, but all charges were later dismissed... Of course, we must speak more loudly about all this, even despite the fact that we certainly did not agree with him on everything. M.S. Gorbachev even bluntly warned him about the urgent need for democratic changes. At the same time, however, I do not think that our readers should perceive the changes now under way in East Europe as unequivocally regressive. It is necessary to speak clearly about the models of socialism being abandoned by these countries. Incidentally, many of the native phenomena would not have been occurring there now if some of these countries had embarked on the democratization of their society much earlier.

D. Pogorzelskiy (NOVOYE VREMYA): My questions concerns the German problems. Germany is the key to European affairs. Do you believe that Germany's unification and what will be essentially united Germany's entry in NATO will create a really new and dangerous military-strategic situation for the Soviet Union? Have there been any fundamental changes in our stance following the meeting with Bush at which this problem was, quite naturally, discussed?

Ye. Primakov: Let me answer your question by asking you another: What sort of NATO? A NATO which is involved in active confrontation with the Soviet Union, a NATO in which emphasis is placed on the military aspect? A NATO which objectively involves united Germany with means of mass destruction? A NATO which is trying to fill the "vacuum" developing in East Europe? It would be different if we were talking about a NATO in which political structures would prevail over military ones. In other words, if it were to repeat the turn [razvorot] being accomplished by our Warsaw Pact. This is already a completely different matter.

As for the talks with Bush, their specific objective was to synchronize the process of Germany's unification with the creation of a security system in Europe. What was intended was bringing NATO and the Warsaw Pact closer together, to establish contacts, and to begin dialogue. As a result, the two blocs should concentrate more on political rather than military questions. This topic

was fruitfully developed at the sitting of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. It was also discussed with Margaret Thatcher.

The pace of Germany's unification really does put us on our guard. Why did H. Kohl, for example, when asked whether he could guarantee the inviolability of borders, say that he could not speak for the next generation? Why must we overlook such remarks?

Many issues arise. One of the main ones is the fact that, even though the war is over, the "Big Four" victors have remained. Their status is being violated in parallel with Germany's unification. We need to guarantee the mechanism which will replace them. It is not mandatory for this mechanism to comprise only the four victors, and it will probably not do so. But the functional replacement must take the form of an agreement, of certain limitations and guarantees.

A. Karpychev (PRAVDA): Please give us a few more details about the Presidential Council. How does it envisage its work, what goals does it set itself? Who is responsible for what there, and is anyone generally responsible for anything?

Ye. Primakov: In answering this question, I would rather tell you what it is not. Thus, the Presidential Council is not an executive organs. Nor is it an organ performing functions of power. The Presidential Council is a consultative organ under the president. It offers certain recommendations to the president and he, if he deems it necessary, implements them in his decisions.

This happened, for example, with the program for transition to market economy, which was proposed by the government. It was discussed twice. At the council's first sitting, everyone spoke in favor of the primary need to elaborate measures providing social guarantees for the population. The council's members agreed that "shock therapy" is unsuitable for our country and we would not adopt it. I recall someone making the following comparison: We are being told to leap out of the window, he said, but we are far from indifferent as regards the nature of this leap—will we land on the asphalt or in water, are we leaping from the first or the fifth story? Following this proposals, the program was most seriously reworked by the government. Now I do not want to talk about the nature of the document which the Supreme Soviet discussed. In my view, it needs further work. It does remain a fact, however, that the retreat from the single-option view actually occurred as a result of the Presidential Council's discussion of "market" problems. The council comprises 16 persons at present. Some concentrate entirely on their work there. Others are council members because they hold certain government offices. Yet others continue their work in science, culture, or public organizations. My sector covers links with the public, the parties, the movements, the Supreme Soviets, and the press.

Generally speaking, it can be said that our Presidential Council differs from the U.S. National Security Council.

The difference in structures must also be taken into account. After all, the President of the United States is also chairman of the government. The government in our country exists as an executive organ separate from the Presidential Council. As far as I can see, the very structure of the Presidential Council is still not completely finalized. Its members ought to be backed up by groups of consultants, and apparatus. But the apparatus is still nonexistent because there are still no premises where it can be located. Briefly speaking, everything is in the process of being set up. A very difficult process, at that.

V. Ovchinnikov (PRAVDA): My questions concern the most sensational episode of the USSR president's trip to the United States—Gorbachev's meeting with No Tae-u in San Francisco. PRAVDA was the first to comment on it, doing so—one might say—at its own risk. This meeting's effect on the political atmosphere in the Asian-Pacific region can already be felt. When and how was the idea of the meeting in San Francisco conceived? What does it hold in store for the future?

Ye. Primakov: It can be said that the idea certainly was not spontaneously conceived. It was gestating for a long time. It would be incorrect to perceive the Soviet-South Korean summit meeting as some sort of a deal, claiming that Moscow is apparently engaging in political contacts in order to obtain loans, equipment, and consumer goods in exchange. Having attended that meeting, I can testify: No such accords were even mentioned at it.

It is a different matter that No Tae-u evidently wanted to conduct this meeting with utmost propaganda pomp. The Soviet side had different interests. This is why it was agreed that correspondents would not be admitted to the meeting. Not even for a pre-meeting photo call. True enough, after the meeting Mikhail Sergeyevich consented to No Tae-u's persistent requests that at least one photographer be admitted.

As regards the consequences of the San Francisco meeting, this is certainly not a closed topic for comment. The Soviet Union, having confirmed its stance on the Korean problem, is prepared to assist the development of a North-South dialogue and the cause of Korea's peaceful unification. This is the path leading to the easing of tension on the Korean Peninsula, the strengthening of peace and stability in the Asian-Pacific region. And this is what constitutes the essence of the initiatives put forward in Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk.

I. Fesunenkov (State Television and Radio): Our recent debates have increasingly often produced statements with—figuratively speaking—national-patriotic overtones. Leave Russia alone, it is said. We do not need any external ties, we will not sell our natural resources to anyone. And Russia will then "forge its own path." What is your attitude toward this philosophy? To put it simply, should we go it alone or is it still necessary to rely on the West's technology and possibly its capital?

Ye. Primakov: First of all, there is no need to mix different concepts. It is a fact that Russia needs a most serious program of socioeconomic development, and that Russia, being the Soviet Union's backbone, still has vast areas of underdevelopment. This cannot be ignored. Russia, which has over 80 percent of all the Soviet Union's raw materials and provides 85 percent of foreign currency earnings from foreign trade. Of course, this situation ought to be remedied.

On the other hand, however, it is pointless to talk about Russia going it alone, whether within the Union framework or on worldwide scale. The entire world is developing on the basis of international division of labor. The Americans install British engines on their aircraft and make extensive use of Japanese electronics. We would condemn ourselves to backwardness if we were to opt for autarkic development, even within the framework of our extremely rich country. It would also be incorrect to abandon the sale of oil and gas. There has been a long-standing argument about which is more advantageous—to leave our mineral resources untouched in the hope that prices will rise in the future, or to sell now? It is bad that we are selling oil and gas in order to purchase grain. This is because, to this day, we waste at least 30 percent of the harvest in transportation and storage. Instead of building elevators and highways, we bought grain. Even the Arab principalities do not do this.

V. Korzin: Yevgeniy Maksimovich, what is your attitude toward the creation of Russian Television?

Ye. Primakov: Generally speaking, I feel positive about Russia having its own television, like all other republics. That PRAVDA has its own television, in its capacity as organ of the party Central Committee, and that other organizations also have their own television channels. Even the peasants' congress now raised the question of their own television. If press organs become pluralist in terms of their organization, this process will also extend to television. It seems to me, however, that it is necessary to do everything to ensure that we do not lose our Central Television. If we do all this at the expense of dismembering the Central Television, the cause will be the loser. For example, our television now shows the first and second all-Union programs. The second channel is used for broadcasts by Moscow, Leningrad, and all the Union republics. Suppose that Russia is allocated the second channel—the four time zones in Russia itself will not be covered. And what will happen in the other republics? Do you see? This is why it is necessary to set up new cable channels, rather than splitting the Central Television apart. Naturally, those who set them up will have to have sizeable funds.

S. Butkov (KOMсомolskaya PRAVDA): Judging by all the signs, foreign entrepreneurs are rushing here because we have cheap labor, because they hope to sell output produced here cheaper in Western countries. Does it not seem to you that we are turning from a superpower into a developing state? Maybe it will be worth our while to admit this?

Ye. Primakov: First of all, I categorically disagree that we are on par with developing states. It is, however, a fact that we are lagging behind in many regards and nobody denies this.

And now about the "cheap labor." It would be more accurate to say that foreign entrepreneurs are attracted by both cheap and skilled labor. Where is it to be found in, say, the Far East? Our problem is that if we wanted to boost the Far East we ourselves would probably have to import labor there.

It is therefore pointless to hope that they will come here because they need cheap labor. It is a different matter that a country like Japan, which now ranks first in terms of capital available for investment abroad, is in a position to embark on capital investment in the USSR even in conditions of initial lack of profitability in order to gain advantageous positions in the Soviet market so as to compete in the future. But these are just reflections. In any event, this is not an area where we should expect the process to be automatic.

G. Sidorova (NOVOYE VREMYA): It is evident that various interests always clash in the process of formulating foreign policy, and here I mean the interests of various groups, specifically the military and the politicians. One gets the impression that, following this year's first visit by Baker to Moscow in February, our position at the talks in both Geneva and Vienna became sharply tougher. It happened as if the military had had their say. How do you see the future—how will events develop, and to what extent is this resistance really strong?

Ye. Primakov: You know, it seems to me that the Americans are wrong on two points. First, they divide out society's structure into clans and present all events as if resulting from a struggle between these clans. And second. They believe that we think everything out in advance. And we believe that they think many of their own moves out in advance. Both we and they are confused as regards one another.

Speaking about the military, there are of course specific features here. You can see for yourselves that if the Warsaw Pact ceases to exist as a military organization or, in any event, the issue revolves around curbing the Warsaw Pact Organizations' military side, the military who are responsible for security could say—not without reason—that the depth of defense is changing, that the correlation of forces is changing. In these conditions, they say, it is necessary to take stock of approaches toward arms reduction and so on.

This cannot be brushed aside. At the same time, there are different kinds of military. Their appraisals do not always coincide. And so on. Thus, I would not directly associate any emphasis that might emerge in our foreign policy actions at various stages with the fact that the correlation of forces is changing as a result of a struggle between military and civilians, or between the Foreign Ministry and the Defense Ministry, or between the KGB and someone else... This would be primitive. At the same

time, however, it is natural that positions should influence one another. So far, however, the West's position is the one mainly taken into account. For example, we are far from indifferent about the form and consequences of Germany's unification.

T. Kolesnichenko (PRAVDA): The end of the "cold war" is noteworthy because it produced neither victors nor vanquished. This is obvious. It is also obvious that the process of the development of Soviet-U.S. relations from confrontation to cooperation is built not on the policy "from positions of strength" but on the policy of the "new thinking" and deideologization of interstate relations which was proposed by the Soviet Union. There is, however, another problem—not an interstate but an ideological problem. Even though we claim that defeat was suffered not by socialism itself but by its administrative edict model, this does not, on the whole, make things easier for us.

Ye. Primakov: It seems to me that it is necessary to give up such straightforwardness in the formulation of questions: Who is the victor in the "cold war" and in the ideological struggle in general—socialism or capitalism.

I do not think that the convergence theory was all that stupid or deserved such sweeping condemnation. I think that this will not and cannot occur in terms of ideological fusion. As for the world's interdependence, it is obvious. At the same time, however, programmed and automatic substitution of formations and their reciprocal repulsion do not occur in as straightforward a fashion as the "Short Course" predicted.

At times we underestimate the way in which we ourselves influence the development of capitalism. World socialism has exerted tremendous influence on the development of capitalism. It is more than just the fact that the workers movement forced capitalism to adapt and maneuver in the social sphere. On the other hand, we are taking on and will continue to take on all the best aspects of capitalism, aspects which can be transplanted on our soil. In this regard, I do not think that the reciprocal influence theory is all that stupid.

Therefore, we cannot talk unequivocally about who emerged victorious, socialism or capitalism.

V. Drobkov (PRAVDA): Yevgeniy Maksimovich, you mentioned that public opinion in the West is unprepared to welcome events in the Soviet Union. At times I get the impression that our own public opinion is not fully prepared to welcome events in our own country. Even the government, when making its decisions, probably fails to fully take this factor into account—the extent to which these decisions will be welcomed by public opinion. This is what I would like to ask in this context: Was the announcement of price hikes well timed? It has now become clear that even the republics were not consulted: We know that both the Ukraine and Russia are sharply against this. Nor was account taken of the

image this created in our country at quite an important historical moment, when relations with the other super-power were being clarified.

Ye. Primakov: First of all I would like to say that, on numerous recent occasions, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted the gravity of the fact that the country was psychologically unprepared for what is happening here now. And now about specifics: Is this fact taken into account or not? It seems to me that it is of course not fully taken into account. This must be admitted. We lack the suitable opportunities to do so in our country. We lack a developed sociological service making it possible to take into account the dynamics of people's moods. Let alone what and how all the strata and all groups are thinking. I believe that our Presidential Council must set up such a service, and on a very serious basis at that.

Now about the specific problem of prices. Let me tell you as an economist: Claiming that it is possible to switch to a market with all prices being fixed is a sign of ignorance. This is a populist phrase which is often used to simply attract supporters. This cannot happen in reality. At the same time, however, you are right: The government's report was presented in such a way that the price hike could have been perceived as the main measure along the path to the market. And about the increase of bread prices, by the way. This is rather a pre-market measure. Meant to stabilize the bridgehead we will use to switch to the market. And yet this was presented almost as the paramount market measure. Naturally, this produced the appropriate reaction in the country.

Yu. Glukhov (PRAVDA): How do you appraise the government's other actions in the domestic policy sphere? This is my first question. And my second: Is the special attention given to Soviet-U.S. relations and global problems not detrimental to relations with the third world and possibly the solution of regional problems?

Ye. Primakov: First, about the government's domestic policy. Not that I am duty bound to defend it. But I would like to say this for fairness' sake: Comrades, it is necessary to bear in mind that we are accomplishing an unprecedented transition from a totalitarian to a democratic state. And we are accomplishing this transition by peaceful means—this is the main point. At the same time, we are accomplishing a transition from a unitary state, if you like, to a confederation, a renewed Union. This is, on the whole, a gigantic transition which, willy-nilly as it were, creates a vast quantity of difficulties and complications which were not foreseen in advance.

Many people say: Why did we not, for example, start with the market straight away? We simply could not do that. The economic situation precluded the launch of any radicalization. And our actual conception of the market was different. Do you recall how we started? We started in the belief that all questions could be resolved on the basis of acceleration, within the framework of the administrative edict system. We later retreated from this

and moved on to develop commodity-money relations and the economic accountability of enterprises. We assumed that that was the market. It later emerged that we had no coupling of economic accountability and self-financing, of self-financing and enterprises' autonomy. In other words, life prompted the broader discovery of what we really needed...

It is said at times that perestroika has yielded more positive results externally. I don't know: I may be right or I may be wrong, but it seems to me that when we embarked on the perestroika process we realized that externally we were closer to the point beyond which lay the perishing of mankind. Relative prosperity seemed to prevail domestically. At that time the Central Statistical Administration issued data claiming that our national income was equivalent to more than 60 percent of the U.S. national income. And that we had maintained this level for 20 years. According to estimates by the World Economics and International Relations Institute, that income was less—about 40 percent. But nobody listened to us when we released this figure. The situation inside the country was less well known to us than the situation outside it. This may have had a certain effect.

Now about the third world. I am against ideologizing our policy toward the third world. Nor would I set our global policy in opposition to our policy toward third world countries. Global policy contains many elements of our relations with third world countries. Furthermore, problems which are important for the third world are being resolved on a global scale. Now that we and the United States are moving to a new level of collaboration in the solution of regional conflicts, this is being welcomed by the entire third world.

Frolov Chairs PRAVDA Meeting With Literati

*PM2006101590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3*

["One Information" report: "Perestroika and the Future of Culture"]

[Text] There was a big discussion yesterday at the PRAVDA editorial office on the role of the creative intelligentsia in the renewal of the country, the spiritual revival of the people, and the consolidation of all healthy forces in society. The following well-known literary and art figures took part in this meeting on the eve of the 28th CPSU Congress: M. Anikushin; L. Anninskiy; S. Baruzdin; V. Vasilyev; A. Vasnetsov; R. Gamzatov; A. Dementyev; M. Zakharov; V. Kozhinov; D. Kugultinov; K. Luchko; N. Mgaloblishvili; B. Oleynik; V. Priyemkhov; A. Prokhanov; V. Rozov; S. Rostotskiy; Ye. Svetlanov; G. Sviridov; O. Suleymenov; and D. Khudonazarov; along with members of the PRAVDA editorial collegium V. Gubarev, V. Kozhemyako, and N. Potapov.

The meeting was chaired by I. Frolov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and editor in chief of PRAVDA.

A detailed report will be published in a forthcoming edition of the newspaper.

Girenko Speaks on Nationalities Issues

*PM2006130890 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "On the Road to Renewal"]

[Text] The question of forming a Russian Communist Party was predetermined by the process of broad democratization of society. But will such a resolute step prove destructive? Soviet and foreign correspondents accredited to the 28th CPSU Congress and Russian Party Conference press center put these doubts to A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. At their request, he spoke about aspects of CPSU nationalities policy.

The changes in the CPSU's activity certainly have a major influence on the formation of state policy, the speaker said. And therefore the concern with which people are today observing the changes taking place within its ranks is entirely natural. At present the topicality of this subject arises from the acute nature of events taking place in certain regions of the country. For many years we failed to devote due attention to these problems, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed. The party returned to it at the 19th party conference, since perestroika had opened up the opportunity for a free exchange of opinions. And now national problems have made themselves keenly felt, demanding resolution in the light of present realities. There has been no "delaying" in the examination of the USSR's national state structure and the commencement of practical work in this respect, A.N. Girenko said, because it was necessary to approach a new understanding of the multinational state, prepare public opinion, and develop the appropriate legislative base.

The opportunity has now appeared for practical work to formulate a new Union treaty and the conditions have arisen for the creation of Union republic communist parties. And although we act on the basis of the need for party unity on a countrywide scale, the secretary stressed, the territorial organizations' desire for greater autonomy in the new conditions is a natural reaction to the changing political situation.

Miners' Congress Alarmed by Market Reform

904F0189A Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Jun 90 p 1

[Article by TRUD staff correspondent N. Mokrishchev: "The Congress of Miners"]

[Text] Donetsk—The proceedings of our country's first congress of miners are under way in Donetsk. Two days were devoted to the discussion of the miners' social situation, the progress of implementation of USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No. 608, and other issues.

Many delegates noted that the miners' situation has not improved and has even deteriorated in some regions since the July strikes last year. Despite strict state and public control, the progress of the execution of Resolution No 608 has been extremely slow, and some of its most significant provisions involving the independence of enterprise and their material-technical supplies have ended up blocked.

The congress of miners adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet and to the working people.

The appeal says that the government is failing to cope with the task of overcoming the economic crisis in our country; it is proposed that the issue of no-confidence in the government be raised.

The alarming prospect of a transition to a market economy gave rise to serious concern among the delegates. The peculiarities of the industry, which operates at a planned loss, cause special difficulties. At present, the amount of subsidies is close to R8 billion. However, the subsidies will have to increase by a factor of almost three soon because everything in sight is becoming more expensive, and new fees are being introduced. The closure of dozens of mines operating in the red, primarily those where poor-quality coal is mined, is possible after the introduction of the market. This means that massive unemployment is unavoidable. Clouds are gathering over entire regions, such as the central region of Donbass, the Moscow Basin, Ekibastuz.

The delegates stressed that, in view of this, urgent measures should be taken right now in order to retain the potential and cadres of the industry and reliable social safeguards for miners, including those who will be left without a job.

Representatives of delegations took part in the funeral of five miners from the Donetsk Mine imeni Zasyadko who died on 11 June in a sudden methane gas explosion.

Voluntary Contract Enlistment of MVD Troops

90UN2104A Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 13 Jun 90 p 4

[Article by I. Baranovskiy: "Contract Soldier: Recruitment Has Started for the First Professional Military Subunit"]

[Text] In June of this year, the first company manned on a professional basis will become part of the internal troops. Long-term contracts will be concluded with all of its soldiers and officers.

Ninety persons are today already enrolled in this subunit. A. Griyenko, chief of the political directorate of internal troops of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], informed journalists of this.

Thus, it can be said that the first step has been taken toward a professional army. And it is probably not surprising that it was taken specifically in the internal

troops. During the last two years, they went through the nightmares of interethnic fratricidal conflicts in 18 regions of the country. In this time, VV [internal troops] servicemen arrested about 24,000 criminals and violators of law and order, and more than 4,000 firearms and 500 explosive devices were confiscated. Of course, this kind of work requires tremendous effort, splendid training, and excellent health. And so, everyone cannot cope with it.

Well, and what about the professionals? They must be able to do everything—master weapons and hand-to-hand combat perfectly, handle oneself in any situation, and have nerves of steel. And for this reason, all of their service is in training, and their routine is barracks-like. In a word, it is a difficult livelihood. For just recently, 16 servicemen of the internal troops were killed and four are missing. And how many cobblestones and bottles with a flammable mixture were hurled at the heads of the defenders of law and order? Here are just a few figures: More than a thousand soldiers and officers were traumatized, and a hundred sustained serious bodily injuries.

Therefore, it is not an idle question to ask—how will their work be compensated? In my opinion, too frugally. According to preliminary data, the privates and the sergeants will receive 300-330 rubles [R]. That is, less than a trolley bus conductor...

It is wonderful that in our country there are real people who do not still consider material wealth to be the sole measure. But one cannot forever count on their enthusiasm and gamble on a great sense of patriotism. Is it not mockery to pay a seriously injured soldier R400 as compensation, and the family of one who died, R1,500? There can be objection—they say, we are not that rich. I agree. But we will never become rich if we value the life of an individual this way, especially one in a military uniform who stands in the defense of state interests.

Support Seen for Volunteer, Locally Based Army

PM1806154990 Moscow *IZVESTIYA* in Russian
16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[A. Grazhdankin report under the rubric: "Public Opinion. Poll and Sociologist's Comment": "Society and the Army"]

[Text] According to the results of a recent poll carried out by the All-Union Public Opinion Research Center, 35 percent of those polled believe that the Army deserves full confidence, and a further 29 percent express partial confidence in the Army. For the sake of comparison, 34 percent of those polled express full confidence in the USSR Supreme Soviet, 23 percent in the USSR Council of Ministers, and 37 percent in the central press, radio, and television.

The discussion of "army" problems in the newspapers and journals has not led to a change in the basic

guidelines for the formation of the Army, the organization of army life, and the system of its relations with other social organizations. However, this discussion has enabled the population to form its own opinion as regards the Army's future.

Among the numerous proposals pertaining to military reform, the idea of the restructuring of the internal troops (their formation on the basis of volunteer recruitment rather than conscription) is the most popular. Some 74 percent of those polled expressed themselves in favor of this proposal, compared with 15 percent against. Proposals to abandon conscription altogether and to form the Army on the basis of voluntary enlistment won considerably fewer votes (59 percent "in favor," 29 percent "against"), as did proposals to replace military service with alternative labor service for conscientious objectors (54 percent "in favor," 35 percent "against"). However, it is not difficult to see that these ideas are nonetheless shared by more than half the adult population of the USSR. In comparison with these, the proposal to let draftees serve on the territory of the republic where they are drafted enjoys even greater popularity (63 percent "in favor," 29 "against"). However, the proposal that each republic create its own armed forces did not gain a majority of votes in the Union as a whole (26 percent "in favor," 55 percent "against").

All plans to restructure the Army enjoy the greatest support among young people of conscription and pre-conscription age (up to 25). Apart from that, the idea of a professional army, professional internal troops, and alternative service, and the proposals to create republican armies in which youths of indigenous nationality of the relevant republic would serve (with the exception of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]) enjoy more support from people with higher education than among other social strata. In addition, these proposals are increasingly being supported by women (71 percent "in favor," 19 percent "against").

A critical mood is mounting in society. In a matter of a few months, since the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, confidence in the USSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers has decreased by 7 percent, and in the militia, newspapers, journals, and television by 3 percent. Confidence in the Army over this period has decreased by 1.5 percent.

Combine Pays for Necessary Militia Unit

LD1806134790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1400 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] No one doubts that it is impossible to introduce order in the country and halt the growth in crime using only the forces of law and order. Society must also be mobilized to help. This means that auxiliaries, for example, could fully replace militiamen. On the other hand, it is possible to use every means to strengthen the militia.

Our correspondent in Ivanovo invites us to consider this question:

[Correspondent S. Vetoshkin—identified by caption] The STK [Technical Supervisory Service] has adopted a decision to fund 15 militia personnel from the income generated by financial autonomy at the Ivanovo woollen textiles combine. In addition to that...

[M.I. Kryukov, secretary of the party committee at the woollen textiles combine—identified by caption] In addition, to give full support to the militia personnel, the combine is purchasing a vehicle and we are providing good premises in our small family hostel. Thus, we are creating a militia unit in our district.

[Vetoshkin] Mikhail Ivanovich, why the militia? Why not, for example, workers detachments, such as in other towns?

[Kryukov] Probably we like to do things thoroughly. At the combine we could have created more than one group such as you describe. But it is very healthy to see people in uniform and with armbands in dealing with these matters.

[Vetoshkin] The militia is the militia. And although six of the 13 men in the unit are currently undergoing training, they have had a noticeable effect in keeping down the riff-raff in the district. You will very rarely see drunken disorder here. As regards serious crimes, in the entire time since the start of the year only two have been committed; the militiamen were in hot pursuit and solved them both.

[A.A. Marychev, deputy chief of the Leninskiy rayon internal affairs department in Ivanovo—identified by caption] We would like other enterprises also to allocate money to maintain and beef up militia manning levels. So far we have concluded 34 contracts. But that is not the issue. The main thing is that we cannot recruit, because young men are reluctant to work in the militia. The work is difficult, the hours are unsocial, the pay is little. So young men are not going to work in the militia. Thus there is a shortage of law and order personnel. Many people have written about this, but things so far remain difficult.

Air Force To Fly Chernobyl Children to Europe

PM2006094190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[T. Piskareva report under the "Youth Column" rubric: "Chernobyl Children Will Spend Summer in Europe"]

[Text] Any disaster evokes a charitable response today. Chernobyl and its children represent a most profound shock. Hearts not only in our environmentally neglected country but also worldwide are opening up to meet them.

One of the latest charitable acts will unfold in a few days in young people's summer camps in 15 West European countries. That was the number of countries that

responded to the World Scouting Movement's call by inviting children from Chernobyl to visit.

The scouts will live with the Chernobyl children not only under canvas but also in their family homes. This means that their parents, brothers, and sisters will also be able—albeit not directly—to relate to this terrible calamity.

This aid is undoubtedly free. Our children are to take few things with them—they will be provided with all the essentials, including sleeping bags. France, Switzerland, Luxembourg, Britain, and other European countries will take more than 1,200 children from the disaster zone for this summer's vacation. The hosts are now preparing keepsakes: The Dutch, for instance, want to give each child two bicycles—one for them and one for a friend.

It is a pity to have to point out that other people's selflessness came up against our native callousness. Aeroflot was unable to take the children to Europe.

Fortunately, responsive people were found at the USSR Defense Ministry. They revealed the remarkable potential afforded by conversion. It only took 24 hours to allocate the requisite number of aircraft and rough out a take-off schedule to within half an hour. As well as to notify all the European embassies concerned of the coming flights. They will be military aircraft, after all.

Baptist Leader Klimenko Dies

*LD1806132390 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT
18 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—Presbyter Andrey Klimenko, an erstwhile leader of the Union of Evangelical Christian Baptists, died here today age 76.

The Rev. Andrey Klimenko was involved in the work of international organisations in addition to his church activities. He had been a member of the General Council of the World Baptist Union for ten years.

Pastor Alexey Bychkov, deputy chairman of the Union of Evangelical Christian Baptists, told TASS that the churches grouped in the union and numerous believers profoundly regretted the death of a person who was deeply committed to the faith and peace among nations.

PROBLEMY MIRA Ceases Publication

PM1506111190

[Editorial Report] PMU has received Issue No. 6, signed to press 3 May, of Moscow PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA in Russian in issue No. 5, signed to press 3 May, publishes on page 2 an announcement "from the editors and publishers" which reads:

"With the present issue the journal PROBLEMY MIRA I SOTSIALIZMA ends its 32-year existence. The changes in the international communist and workers movement; the new conditions in the world; the tempestuous and ambiguous processes occurring in the East

European countries; and the material, technical, and other difficulties that have arisen have made the continued publication of this journal practically impossible."

'21st Century TV' To Be Set Up

*LD1506211590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1800 GMT 15 Jun 90*

[Text] A press conference today dealt with current matters concerning the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. Among other things, it was reported that a channel 21st-Century Television is to be set up on the basis of the educational program channel. This is the first attempt to organize a state-public television channel, for 21st Century Television will be set up by various departments and organizations in the country, for instance: the USSR Ministry of Culture, the Culture Foundation, the Charity and Health Foundation, and others. A central part of the programming, which from the beginning of next year will go out for 12 hours every day, will be a series on world art treasures. It is planned to resurrect undeservedly forgotten television performances. Creative, technical, and financial independence will make for interesting creative and educational programs.

These same factors have a bearing on another plan. The main section for youth programs, which recently acquired the status of an independent section within the committee, is to be run both on budget allocations and on funds obtained from its own activities.

'First Commercial Radio Station' Opens in Moscow

LD2006215290

[Editorial report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 20 June broadcasts a four-minute report on the inauguration of a commercial radio station in Moscow. The announcer explains that "The presentation of the Europe "plus USSR joint enterprise has been held in Moscow. This is the name of the first commercial radio station in our country. Our correspondent Vadim Kukushkin reports."

Kukushkin plays back the introductory message of the new radio station, which goes on the air, he says, every evening at 69.8 MHz in the UHF waveband. The station broadcasts music and news bulletins. At the news-conference, it was announced that in the future the station will be on the air for 24 hours. The programs can be received in Moscow and Moscow Oblast only. Kukushkin gives an account of the presentation, playing back voice excerpts from inaugural speeches, including one by Jack Lang, French minister of culture.

Comparison of CPSU Commission Discusses Policies

PM1806075190

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 16 June 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 3 a TASS report of a CPSU

Central Committee International Policy Commission sitting 15 June chaired by Politburo member A.N. Yakovlev. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "CPSU Central Committee Commission Sitting," with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 18 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 43-45, reveals the following variations:

Page 43, column two, paragraph three, first sentence reads: As was noted at the session, the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting confirmed that the principles of the new political thinking drawn up by the Soviet leadership are being instilled in the fabric of interstate relations and actively working in favor of restructuring in our country and universe. (rewording)

Page 44, column one, first full paragraph, second sentence reads: The commission expressed its conviction about the need for actively using the external political and economic prerequisites which have taken shape, for the purposes of resolving topical and long-term problems in the development of the country's national economy and for setting up of contemporary production facilities for satisfying the demands of Soviet people for goods and services. (rewording)

Page 44, column two, paragraph five, sentence three reads: But the main guiding line remains as before—the cooperation of all left-wing, democratic forces. (rewording)

Page 44, column two, paragraph seven, only sentence reads: ...mechanical engineering factory; Ye.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences... (correcting initials)

Economic

Leningrad Poll Shows Attitudes on Market

904A0432A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 p 2

[Article by V. Sibirev, candidate of economic sciences: "The Market: Are We Ready for a Change?"]

[Text] The problem of a transition to a regulated market economy has become a central one. It does not simply interest, but it agitates and disturbs almost every Soviet citizen. The publication of the report of N.I. Ryzhkov at the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the entire course of his discussion showed an unusual complexity and contradiction of the perception of the entire complex of questions relating to the transition to a market economy. This especially affects impending changes in retail prices.

The extremely complicated internal contradictory attitude of Leningraders toward the market and market forms of organization of economic life is indicated in the results of a telephone poll of 951 respondents conducted

from 14 to 21 May 1990 by the center for the study of social needs under the sociology faculty of Leningrad University.

The poll shows that under present condition a growing number of residents realize that there is no alternative to the market path of development. This opinion is now shared by 40.5 percent of those polled. This, of course, is a lot. However, there is also a large share of those who still believe in the possibility of different versions of an effective development of the economy. They constitute almost one-third (32.9 percent). For many (26.6 percent), the question of an alternative still remains unclear.

The attitude toward a market path of development is determined by many factors. One of them is the assessment of those changes in the life of society that will result from the transition to market forms of organization of the economy. Fifty percent believe that the economic situation in the country in connection with the transition to a market will worsen at first, that it will later stabilize, and that subsequently it will improve. There are 29.5 percent who are convinced that the transition to a market will only aggravate the crisis. And only 6.5 percent of the respondents expect almost an immediate improvement in the situation in the country.

If we talk about the very main reason for the restrained and even sharply negative attitude toward the market on the part of a majority of the population, then it is associated with the realization (including intuitively) of the inevitability of an increase in the difficulties and adversities of life, if not for all, then for many. This is also well understood by those who realize that there is no alternative to the market path of development. Thus, in the given group of those polled, 39 percent assume a temporary drop in their incomes, and 27 percent, that their incomes will drop sharply.

How does the structure of subjective estimates of possible changes in their real incomes look overall?

Overall, 42.4 percent believe that their real incomes will decline sharply for a long time; 26.3 percent expect that the decline in their incomes will be temporary, and 18.1 percent hope that incomes will remain unchanged. And only 6.2 percent of those polled think that their incomes will rise.

There is also great anxiety about holding on to jobs. Almost two-thirds of those polled (63 percent) are confident that they will not lose their job in the transition to a market economy. And 19 percent believe that they will have to leave their jobs, but 18 percent have difficulty answering this question.

It is obvious that, with such subjective estimates of possible changes in work and living conditions associated with a change to a regulated economy, to all appearance there should be no expectation of unequivocal support and approval of the present policy on the part of the broad masses of workers. And this, in turn, suggests the conclusion about the unavoidability of a

very detailed and reasoned explanation for the planned directions in the reorganization of the economy.

Attention should be given particularly to an explanation of the thesis concerning the absence of an alternative to the market path of development. Apparently, it is also not possible to avoid the question of the inevitability of lowering incomes, unemployment, and other social costs. The people must understand that it is practically impossible without certain sacrifices to switch from an outdated system of economic management which doomed the country to an intensification of stagnation phenomena and to a greater drop in the standard of living, which, incidentally, became especially perceptible in recent years, to a new market system of economic management that assured a dynamic and efficient development of the economy. Society is in a condition only to lessen and limit them. In this regard, special attention should be paid to the elaboration and inculcation of an effective system of social protection.

The results of the poll indicate that the policy itself of switching the economy to market principles should certainly be constructed with consideration for the psychological mood of the broad masses of workers. Taking the existing mood into account is also important to a resolution of the question of standardizing the distribution (sale) of essential consumer goods. It is interesting to note that the poll disclosed, and it was conducted before the mass purchase of practically all commodities by the population began, that 49 percent were supporters of the ration card system.

The results of the poll show that attempts at an accelerated abrupt transition to market methods of organization of the economy will hardly be understood and accepted by a majority of the population.

Deputies Comment on Market Reform Program

904A0421A Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNY VESTNIK in Russian No 23, Jun 90 pp 2, 3, 6, 7

[Statements on the reform program by N. Gritsenko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission For Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy; Doctor of Economic Sciences M. Bronshteyn, USSR people's deputy, department section head at the University of Tartu; A. Veprev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Agrarian Issues and Foodstuffs; and Academician O. Bogomolov, USSR people's deputy: "Opinions—Polemics—Assessments"]

[Excerpts] *The concept of a transition to a market economy submitted by the government for discussion by the USSR Supreme Soviet has caused the most extensive public reverberations. This is quite easy to explain: We may say without exaggeration that the future of our economy and our country hinges on the decisions proposed. Discussions associated with the draft government program are under way not only within the confines of the parliament, in the scientific community, and in the press, but also in labor collectives and in every Soviet family.*

Naturally, opinions are far from unambiguous. At present, nobody argues against the need for market relations. However, which exact way to the market should we take? Opinions on this differ. Today, we are giving the floor to authors who hold different views and different positions. We hope that comparing their points of view will be helpful in finding the truth.

N. Gritsenko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for the Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy: "There Is No Other Variant"

I view the transition to a market economy proposed by the government as a means, a form, and a way to draw labor collectives into production management which embraces the whole process from raw materials procurement to the sales of products.

Actually, a market has existed in our country throughout our 70 years. However, the producers of goods entered the all-Union market through middlemen: They sort of provided their goods for sale on commission. The ministries, the Gosplan [State Planning Committee], and the Gosnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supplies] were involved in sales. They were also the ones who gave orders to the working people.

The skills of the people, their awareness, and democratic institutions have now grown; the genuine emergence of the labor collectives has now occurred which can do without middlemen and can enter into direct relations with consumers and suppliers. Of course, in the course of this the discipline of deliveries should be maintained and state orders should be fulfilled. Therefore, we should welcome the market if we view it as the one which operates with the direct participation of the labor collectives accomplishing economic tasks of national significance.

However, it is necessary to ensure the social security of the working people and prevent a drop in the living standard until we establish stable direct relations, until prices come to be commensurate with the generally necessary input of labor, until we learn about equivalent exchange, that is, for as long as the period of formation lasts. It is with this in view that the mechanism of compensation is being turned on. These are the costs entailed by a period of transition rather than the market.

The government program contains a large block of measures and reserves which make it possible for us to ensure the social security of the people. For example, when we discussed the concept in our commission, we said that the emphasis in it should not be defensive: A production facility pushes a man out, he becomes unemployed, and only then does the state system help him find a job. It is necessary to anticipate the negative phenomena, create jobs in advance, and prevent the appearance of unemployment. The same is the case with prices: We should determine in advance what needs to be done so that prices do not hit the working man in the wallet, so that the purchasing power of the ruble does not fall, and so that the savings of the people are protected. We

should also think through the ways and means of saturating the market with consumer goods using domestic and foreign-economic opportunities and reserves.

These are just some of the thoughts which come to mind in the course of examining the government document. On the whole, we believe that we should embark on the new road deliberately and proceed down this road. Obvious as it is that an all-people's discussion is necessary, we should present to the people not only the drawbacks associated with our transition to the market but also its advantages and show the benefits it gives the people. We do not have another variant, we cannot stand in place.

[Passage omitted]

M. Bronshteyn, USSR people's deputy, head of a department section at the University of Tartu, doctor of economic sciences: "A High Price Is Figured In"

I will say right away that for us there is no alternative to a transition to a market. This is absolutely clear. However, at issue is the pace, the mechanism, and the price we will have to pay for this transition. This is to say that economic and sociopolitical problems arise in this matter.

An accelerated transition is possible, but its price is high. Apparently, this makes the government apprehensive, although under this combination of more rapid movement toward the market and a higher payment for this the market may give returns for us sooner, whereas in the other variant this would be postponed until later.

In general, if you analyze this document attentively, you see that a high price is still figured in it. This includes a period of structural reductions in production, and unemployment, no matter what they call it. Employment reserves? However, an official will not go immediately to the sphere of services, nor will a worker at an open-hearth furnace go to trade. That is to say, structural unemployment is unavoidable.

Something else is also alarming: the striving to balance the market and the budget mainly through price increases which are not fully compensated (the amount being R65 billion a year). We indeed give a guarantee of 100-percent compensation to retirees and others who are low-paid. This is understandable. But who is going to pay for the transition? Apparently, the most active segment of our society. Really, it should be this segment that gives us the wherewithal to climb out of the hole. Yet, the main burden of direct and indirect taxes and surcharges for social funds will be placed on the shoulders of these people. Will all of them withstand this burden?

Of course, we do not have resources, this is true. However, if we do not have material resources, may we, perhaps, provide the resource of freedom? Indeed, all of our recent activities in the parliament—the Law on Land, the Law on Property, and so on—have been meant to provide this resource, to remove the influence of the

state, and to eliminate the total socialization of property. This approach resolves two issues simultaneously: Spare money is eliminated and "tied up" because a large segment of it is applied to buyouts, and the initiative of the people is released.

Unfortunately, this line is reflected in the program indirectly. It is no accident that the people have failed to see it, and have seen price increases which cannot be avoided as the main point. As far as the second issue is concerned, it is not being duly resolved because in our country even the good laws—on leasing and land—do not work: There is no mechanism for implementing them, that is to say, the resources of freedom are being delayed.

This is the weakness of both the program and our legislative activities.

Here is another point which is not taken into account: objective processes under way in our country and a new situation emerging in relations between the republics and the central authorities. Recall how many days we spent adopting the Law on Retirement Benefits, the battle which we fought, and many a broken lance. There were demands to increase retirement benefits for shepherds, milkmaids, and many other categories. Meanwhile, all of this had to be given to the republics, and only a regional development fund should have been left in order to compensate for unfavorable conditions in a number of regions.

The government program may end up not being implemented if every region overcomes the difficulties of transition to the market on the principle: "Save yourself any which way you can." I also believe that adopting a law or, more precisely, a treaty between the republics as sovereign states on the foundations and mechanism for operating the all-union market is a priority task.

A. Veprev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Agrarian Issues and Foodstuffs: "I Am Voting 'In Favor'"

The food-supply situation has been deteriorating with every passing year. To be sure, lease relations and economic accountability have given a certain impetus to the development of production.

However, what does economic accountability mean under the current economic system? I will discuss this based on my experience as director of the Nazarovskiy Sovkhoz [state farm] in Krasnoyarsk Kray. The farm has about R10 million in its account. However, the farm cannot spend these funds or, more precisely, use them to boost production potential and accomplish social tasks. All of this is because our economy and material technical supplies are a flawed ration-card system.

Life itself is prompting us to tear down this system. Otherwise, we will not bring back real masters of the land and will not set up peasant farms. After all, they will not have it easy if a kolkhoz [collective farm] or sovkhoz or

a farmer are unable to purchase necessary material resources for ready cash. This is why a market is an objective necessity for agriculture.

Actually, we have already come close to the market. Look at the introduction of contract prices for potatoes, vegetables, and fruits. Undoubtedly, these are elements of the market. At this point, I should add that had we taken this step much sooner many problems with the supply of potatoes and fruit and vegetable products would have been solved by now. Their quality would have also improved abruptly.

Therefore, I am voting in favor of market relations in the agrarian sector. The sooner we introduce them the better the possibility will be of ameliorating the situation in the national economy of our country. The only issue is whether we are going to switch to new economic conditions right away or gradually. Everything needs to be weighed thoroughly in this matter.

Now for the most painful point, the increases in food prices. I believe that it would be incorrect to reduce everything only to the growth in food prices in our discussion of the market relations. Indeed, prices are a component of the market, but they are not the only one. Meanwhile, a shift in accents has occurred. The people have noticed just one thing in the government program: the abruptly increasing prices of food staples, including even bread. All of this has caused a negative reaction. Unfortunately, a certain segment of the populace has become convinced that the government has resolved to increase retail prices by decree. Personally, I believe that our transition to the market cannot be reduced only to the price increases. We should take a much broader view of this issue.

**O. Bogomolov, USSR people's deputy, academician:
"Additional Work Lies Ahead"**

Apparently, the document proposed by the government establishes firm bearings for a transition from a command-administrative system to market relations. For a long time, the tug-of-war proceeded in favor of the administrative system. However, now both the government and the parliament are convinced that we have no other option but to make the transition to a genuine market which is, naturally, under certain social control. We should note that the government came out with honest self-criticism: It admitted that life had frustrated previous calculations envisaging the invigoration of the economy. At issue is both the 1990 plan and a program for a longer period of time which turned out to be unable to slow the growth of negative tendencies in the economy.

Still, I would not say that the new document represents an ultimately thought-through concept of our transition to a socially-oriented market economy. A concept alone is not enough to accomplish such a transition. It is also necessary to have a thoroughly developed and balanced mechanism for its implementation. Its principles and details have not been released to the public, despite the

fact that work is proceeding on a number of laws. The concept itself should be outlined more specifically so that there will not be different ways to interpret it.

As I see it, the very direction of the transition to the market which has been opted for gives rise to doubts. I mean combining the free-market self-regulation of the most significant economic processes and extensive administrative, non-economic coercion. The two could not be combined in any East European country. That is to say, at issue is a hybrid of directive planning and a quasi-market. Besides, the document contains no definition of what the market is, which functions it should perform, and what we are striving for. There are no guarantees of the freedom of producers and consumers and a transition to genuine competition. The sphere of consumption (production of agricultural products, the food and light industries) in which the freedom of market relations is most promising is covered by administrative regulation. That is to say, it seems to me that strict, and even shock-type, fiscal measures are being taken.

It is possible that the people would have agreed to this had they known in the name of what such sacrifices are being made. Apparently, both a change in the proportion of prices and price increases are unavoidable in the course of the transition to a genuine market where demand and supply are in balance, and a real currency which is freely convertible into goods and foreign currencies circulates instead of a quasi-currency. However, who is going to agree to a drop in the standard of living by one-third in 1990 and 1991 without being firmly convinced that a market saturated with goods will develop, and lines and speculation will disappear?

In my opinion, which I advocated in the Presidential Council, in the USSR Supreme Soviet, and at government meetings, the gradual and consistent nature of introducing the market should mean something else: the creation of sectors of free market relations, one after another, within our still command-administrative, rather than market, economy. This was done in China, for instance, and it is being done in Bulgaria where, for example, the emancipation of agricultural producers is being carried out; their relationship with the state is being built on the basis of genuine trade. Why should we not take this path? We may take a number of measures to tie up spare money in order to avoid price increases in the process.

The path of privatization which is merely sketched in the program is also attractive. It is necessary to prepare it, taking into account the best our and foreign economic science have to offer. Why foreign science as well? Unfortunately, the dominance of the command-administrative system has brought about the absence of serious research on market relations in our country. Hence this conclusion: It would be useful to enlist foreign experts for consultations.

[Passage omitted]

Novosibirsk 'Council' Oversees Conversion Problems*PM2006153790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 90 First Edition p 2*

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences Yu. Ananin, first deputy chairman of Novosibirsk Oblispolkom, under the "Problems and Opinions" rubric: "The Oblispolkom and Conversion"]

[Text] The conversion at defense industry enterprises in our oblast began in a seemingly uncontrolled way, without a clearly thought-out or economically sound plan. Indeed, how could it be otherwise, when the relevant decisions on a nationwide scale were adopted within the existing five-year plan and ratified annual programs. The simplistic approach which suggests that you can use the same equipment to produce both weapons and consumer goods also had an effect.

It became clear quite quickly that additional capacities and the technological restructuring of production are needed in order to manufacture complex goods, including consumer durables. The situation was exacerbated by the fact that reliable supplies were withdrawn and assimilating the new output took time. The fact that the country lacked a unified organ for conducting the conversion also made the task more complicated.

In the face of this, the Novosibirsk Oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] was obliged to form a coordination council for conversion. We primarily proceeded on the basis of the idea that we should not lose the high-class labor potential that we had accumulated over many years, but correctly determine the priorities in the continued development of enterprises.

According to preliminary estimates, the manufacture of civilian output as a whole at the enterprises will more than double the figure for 1990 by the end of the present five-year plan. In addition, priority has been given to the manufacture of equipment for enterprises in the agro-industrial complex, light industry, trade, and public catering and to the development of electronics and computer engineering, consumer goods, and medical equipment.

As the volume of production of already assimilated and previously manufactured forms of civilian output increase, new ways of manufacturing will also be assimilated. For example, the "Sever" association will start producing equipment for separators, low-dosage x-ray machines, and personal computers; the low-voltage equipment factory will produce electric mixers; and the precision machine-building plant will produce equipment to stimulate cardiac activity.

The range of tasks that we intend to resolve in this sphere as part of the conversion is very wide, but they are very difficult to implement in the face of shortages in the economy. When the manufacture of a particular form of military output is suspended, this affects the activity of a large number of related enterprises. And the main

problem is in supplying the new production units with the necessary equipment and sets of materials.

There are also cadre problems. The overwhelming majority of workers are transferring to the manufacture of civilian output, but there will actually be job losses—in five years' time, this will affect over 1,000 people. Undoubtedly, they will not be left without work. Training in new specializations will be provided for them, taking into consideration their age and professional ability.

A trend of deterioration has become noticeable in the analysis of economic indicators of the enterprises' work. There are several reasons for this. First, the civilian output that is produced and assimilated does not compare with defense output in terms of profitability, which leads to a decrease in labor collectives' profit. It is expected that in the defense complex it will increase by 15 percent as a whole in the current year, while in individual enterprises such as the Novosibirsk aviation associations and some others it will lead, in the final analysis, to a decrease in the resources for material and social development.

For the time being, in a number of cases, we are unable to overcome departmental alienation, all kinds of communication failures, and downright absurdities. You will agree that it is scarcely economical for powerful modern enterprises to start producing the most simple types of equipment. This is quite simply frittering away the available intellectual, technical, and other potential.

I believe that, at the current stage, the defense complex forces should concentrate on resolving problems which other sectors of industry are unable to resolve. And of course, it is necessary to accelerate the adoption of a single conversion program for the whole country.

AUCCTU Calls for Economic Safeguards*904F0190A Moscow TRUD in Russian 15 Jun 90 p 1*

[“Appeal of the AUCCTU Presidium to the Trade Union Councils and Committees, to All Trade Union Organizations”]

[Text] On 13 June of this year, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution “On the Concept of a Transition to a Regulated Market Economy in the USSR.”

Assessing objectively the situation in our country and perceiving profoundly the alarm of the Soviet people, the trade unions insisted continuously that the government persuade the people that a transition to market relations is unavoidable and tell them honestly and openly about the difficulties of a period of transition. The trade unions favor the consolidation of all healthy forces of our society and realize that the road to invigorating the economy lies through the intensive and diligent labor of all people.

The position of the trade unions, which was repeatedly stated in the Presidential Council, at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, on TV, in the press, and by quite a number of trade union councils and committees, is that our transition to the market economy is predicated on the conscious consent of the Soviet people. However, the trade unions demand that before switching to the market social shock-absorbers be built into our economic system which will offset its possible unfavorable consequences for various categories of the populace, primarily for individuals whose incomes are fixed.

The AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals on the priority development of laws intended to protect the economic and social rights and interests of citizens in conjunction with the transition to the market economy, including an antiinflation law, laws on employment, on the subsistence minimum and minimum wages, on indexing the income of the populace taking into account the movement of prices of consumer goods and services, on financial aid and other types of compensation for individuals facing an emergency (natural disasters, difficult ecological situations, interethnic and other conflicts), on regulating labor relations, on the rights of trade unions, on conversion, on environmental protection, on collective contracts and agreements, and on occupational safety. A new wording of the Foundations of the Housing Law of the USSR and Union Republics, a ukase on aid to the low-income populace, and ukases on the economic and legal protection of health care, education, and culture in the USSR should also be adopted.

The trade unions believe that in a new market environment the need to create a reliable system for protecting the population primarily against so-called social risks—disease, disability, unemployment and inflation—will increase manifold.

For its part, the AUCCTU has worked out and submitted to the government its own versions of the draft laws on employment, indexing the monetary income of the populace taking into account the movement of prices for goods and services, and proposals on the level of the subsistence minimum and protection of the low-income strata of the populace.

The AUCCTU will persistently ensure compliance with the provisions of the laws and legislative acts adopted for protecting the interests of all citizens of our country, and it is urgently calling on the trade union organizations to get vigorously involved in this work at all levels where issues are resolved.

We are profoundly convinced that a transition to the market is only possible if the citizens of our country become profoundly aware of the essence of forthcoming transformations and extend the credit of confidence in the measures of the government. Within the framework of businesslike partnership with the local soviets of

people's deputies, the trade union councils and committees are called upon to conduct extensive explanatory work preceding an all-people's referendum in the interest of the working people.

In the environment of universal shortages, the virtually uncontrollable growth of prices, and the "disappearance" of popular inexpensive goods, the trade union organizations are called upon to exercise strict workers' control over the propriety of setting and using prices, to prevent the discontinuation of production of inexpensive goods, and to ensure efficient conversion in the defense industry.

It is extremely important to step up the work of trade unions on signing agreements and collective contracts which should set forth measures to ensure the full employment of those who want and are able to work productively, setting the level of the subsistence minimum taking into account the peculiarities of all republics and regions, determining the level and rate of inflation taken into account in the course of indexing incomes, setting ceilings for the prices of vital goods produced and sold on their territories, giving aid to the low-income groups of the populace living below the poverty line, ensuring occupational safety, and other issues.

The trade union organs need to have an extensive and objective bank of statistical data, analyses of the "consumer basket" calculated for specific regions with regard to various groups of the populace, surveys of family budgets in the predicted market environment, including trends in the movement of prices, and the status of the shadow economy, in order to resolve all of these issues in a skilled manner.

The AUCCTU is extremely concerned about the possibility of difficulties with the supply of the main types of foodstuffs to the populace increasing at the stage of our transition to the market. In conjunction with this, trade unions should persistently ensure that the soviets of people's deputies implement effective measures to prevent reductions in the assortment of necessary foodstuffs and a possible drop in the standard of living of the populace. To this end, all available forms of the distribution mechanism should be used to maintain the consumption by families of the main, vital foodstuffs (meat, milk, fish, vegetable oil, sugar) acquired at state retail prices at the level of the consumer standard which has developed in our country. To this end, it is important to extensively take advantage of the potential of charitable organizations, the chain of public-catering establishments, the canteens and cafes of the organizations and enterprises of industry, transportation, construction, agriculture, and cooperation.

Not a single trade union organization or organ should remain on the sidelines in this endeavor!

Legal Basis for Regulated Market Needed

904A0410A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Academician V. Kudryavtsev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; S. Alekseyev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, chairman of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee; Doctor of Legal Sciences Yu. Kalmykov, chairman of the Committee for Legislation of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and Doctor of Legal Sciences V. Yakovlev, USSR minister of justice: "Market: The Opinion of Lawyers"]

[Text] The need to make a transition to a regulated market economy is perceived by our entire people. We would like to believe that it will soon become the focus of the national program of rebirth and prosperity of the motherland and of our civil accord. Legislative acts, government programs, and ministerial documents are being prepared amid clashes of opinions and interests, passions and stereotypes, ambitions and private claims.

Many difficulties will occur in the course of a transition to a market economy, including major and painful ones, such as the actual transformation of ownership relations and breaking down our mass mentality, which to a great degree is one of dependency. However, let us look at the desirable optimal version: All difficulties and obstacles have been overcome, and all prerequisites for the regulated, optimal market economy in our country have been created. What will happen then?

Nothing will happen! That is to say, multi-faceted complex processes in the economy will develop, some new things will strike sparks and roll, but at the same time the elements which are disorderly and cruel and are accompanied by the deteriorating destructive phenomena which traumatize our society will get out into the open. No accelerating improvement in our entire national economic life will come about.

Why? Because a regulated market economy needs a firm, fine-tuned, perfect legal foundation which ensures the regular operation of the entire complex system of money-and-goods relations and structures.

We state with the full weight of authority that at present there is no legal basis for a regulated market economy in our country. The documents being prepared at present are merely acts which regulate a transition to the market. The recently adopted laws on property, on land, and on leasing touch only on individual issues, and even they are primarily attuned to switching to new economic relations. The rest of legislative and other acts date back to "the past," to the time of an administrative-command system, even the civil codes of union republics dating back to 1922, the time of the NEP [New Economic Policy], were emasculated and tied to administrative-plan regimentation as a result of novelties of the 1960s.

Norm-setting documents on capital construction, deliveries, transportation, credit, as well as, in general, all others, are mainly adapted for administrative-plan regulation.

Meanwhile it is hard to even conceive of the tremendous enormity of questions, unsolved problems, and difficult situations which are going to suddenly bear down on participants in economic relations in the environment of a regulated market! How and according to which procedures are they to come to an agreement with each other, on what terms? What should the mutual relations of partners be at exchanges and fairs? To what degree and through what procedures is it possible to defend one's rights? Are there norms to serve as bearings in the course of resolving the issues of various services, partnerships, insurance, bank operations? And so on, and so forth.

What is to be done? Where do we go?

A free and equivalent exchange of assets produced is what a market essentially is. It means a direct link between production and consumption, and it subordinates the former to the requests of the latter. A balanced market, in which prices reflect the average social costs of production, dictates its firm requirements to every producer and makes him reduce the costs of production, use financial, material, and labor resources thriftily, and increase labor productivity on the basis of scientific and technical accomplishments. The market has equally strict requirements with regard to the quality of products and goods. Therefore, the market is a system of self-regulation in the economy which provides incentives for the development of production and for the development of the quantitative and qualitative aspects of production. Due to this, the market has survived throughout all socio-economic formations as one of the greatest creations in human history.

However, by its very nature the market is contradictory and, due to its inherent spontaneity, capable of bringing about not only progress, but also depressions, crises, and even the complete destruction of the economic system. The crises which shook capitalism in the late 1920s and early 1930s are known. However, capitalism has overcome this shock and has been able to ensure colossal development of production.

What has helped to overcome the spontaneous forces of the market which were supposed to ruin capitalism? The point is that the capitalist state has learned to regulate demand and supply, the heart of the market, and has created powerful means for regulating the market at its macro-level without disrupting the very nature and mechanisms of self-regulation at the micro-level. The market has become controllable. Due to this, the menacing forces of destructive spontaneity which it carries with it have been reined in. At the same time, it remains a market which retains all of its potential for economic incentives for production through the freely performed exchange of goods and money.

The system of market regulation which has been created is very complex and multi-faceted. It includes the sub-systems of finance and currency, budget, credit, tax, and price regulations, the main goal of which is to maintain demand and supply, consumption and accumulation, and the stock of goods and money supply in balance. All violations of these normal ratios on a macro-level destabilize the market and endanger the regular operation of the economy.

Another powerful market regulator is found in the thoroughly adjusted legislation which sets "the rules of the game" in the market, thus turning it from wild to civilized, based not only on the economically fair equivalent exchange but also on compliance with the legal rules for the protection of the weaker party, usually, the citizen, the consumer, the small producer, and so on. Such regulations include anti-monopoly (anti-trust) legislation, legislation on property, on transactions, on contracts and obligations, on consumer protection and responsibility to the consumer, on labor and the social security of certain groups of the populace, on the protection of nature in the sphere of production, and so on.

Under our conditions, both the market and our transition to it should be regulated from the very beginning. We cannot make a transition to the market without creating a regulatory system; otherwise, this will be a wild market destroying the economy and society itself. The regulatory systems should be formed in advance.

It is necessary not only to switch to the market but also to dismantle its opposite, the administrative-command economy, and transfer economic relations from the vertical dimension to the horizontal one. If this is done abruptly the economy will collapse. We need to replace a system of direct management of the economy with a system of regulating it, but dismantling the elements of the former only when the elements of the latter are put in action. In the process, many elements of direct management should be transformed into a regulatory system.

Two main tasks are to be accomplished. The first one is to master within a short period of time methods of economic regulation which can make it possible for our society to live within its means, balance demand and supply, and balance the stock of goods and money supply. Only on this condition will the market begin to work positively, will it stimulate production rather than speculation, will it reduce rather than increase prices, and will it not bring about social cataclysms. Only if this prerequisite is ensured may we give up direct price regulation and introduce free market prices.

The second enormous task is to create a comprehensive complex, the legislative regulation of market relations without gaps.

A certain foundation for such legislation has been created; the new laws on ownership, on land, on leasing, and on taxes have been adopted. Acts of anti-monopoly legislation, those on small enterprises, on joint-stock

companies, on other economic companies and associations, on banks and securities, and so on are being prepared. Legislation on labor and on environmental protection is being renewed.

However, the main point is to create and use fully the institutes of civil law—a legislative instrument which has evolved historically for the specific purpose of regulating market and goods-and-money relations.

As a rule, the emergence of the NEP, when goods-and-market relations began to be asserted following war communism and the civil war, is associated with the replacement of foodstuffs requisitioning with the tax in kind, free trade, and opportunities for private-enterprise activities.

However, few people notice that the NEP also began with the rapid adoption of civil legislation, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Civil Code. A system of civil legislation was enacted within several months—several months!—of the decision on making a transition to the NEP, virtually simultaneously with it. In the process, V.I. Lenin handled work on many of its provisions personally.

Why is it "civil" legislation? It would appear that if it is "civil" it would be something having to do with citizens only. This is a mere verbal coincidence. It is "civil" because this sphere of legislation is the expression and a component of civil society, that is, a society separate from the state authorities and built on the autonomy and independence of participants in property relations (proprietors), who transact all of their business themselves, as they please. However, all of this is exactly what we need for a market economy or, if we take a somewhat broader view of things, for a democratic, self-governing society.

This is what is characteristic. The course of world history proves with mathematical precision that, as soon as market relations begin to develop, an extensive and fine-tuned system of civil law emerges.

On the eve of human civilization, at the ancient time when goods-and-money or, in essence, market relations began to appear, a system of legal norms commensurate with them also appeared which the Romans called civil law. Even then this notion was not used only to determine the legal status of a citizen but to regulate all property relations which developed in the sphere of economic operations. In other words, civil law regulated everything related to the market: the legal situation of citizens and organizations (the notion of a corporate person appeared at the time), procedures for signing agreements and other transactions, the status of the owner of property and his legal powers.

Still, these were the first steps in the development of the market and in the assertion of law expressing it. Hundreds of years passed, and generations and formations changed, before a more perfect system of market relations appeared on the wave of the industrial revolution

which brought to life new legislation as well. In European countries, the French Civil Code (the Napoleonic Code) of 1804 was the first such act to become the foundation of legislative regulation of market relations in many states of the world. Engels noted that "the Napoleonic Code is the collection of laws which is the foundation for all new codifications on all continents."

Why did this act become so universally significant, so "long-lasting" (it applies to this day as well) and popular? Apparently, because the code was quite in line with a new system of social relations and regulated them in the direction needed regardless of where it applied. The unity of legal regulations was predetermined (and is still predetermined) by the qualitative homogeneity of market relations and the commonality of principles on the basis of which they develop. To be sure, in the 20th century bourgeois civil law has undergone significant changes associated with the appearance of monopolies, international concerns, and the development of a scientific-technical revolution; however, the main provisions of it remain stable to this day.

Soviet civil law meets the requirements of the market. The civil law amounts to a set of institutions which make it possible to regulate the goods-and-money relations without gaps and in a comprehensive manner. It is a universal regulator which makes it possible to use its institutions with regard to relations between subjects of any composition regardless of whether state, cooperative, leased, collective, joint-stock, or any other enterprises and associations, both Soviet and joint and foreign, as well as Soviet and foreign civilians take part in them. The main value of the institutions and instruments of the civil law (the right of property, the subjects of civil law—citizens and various corporate persons as participants in the relations of property and goods-and-money exchange, contracts and obligations, and means for property protection and responsibility for violations of the law in the sphere of the goods-and-money exchange) is in the fact that they are especially designed to regulate goods-and-money relations.

The entire world regulates procedures for setting up corporate persons in the economic sphere, the relations of property and leasing, the signing and execution of contracts for the sale of goods and services, insurance, contracting and construction, mortgages, credit, settlements, protection of consumer rights, and so on.

As is known, the market presupposes the freedom of participants in economic interaction to resolve economic issues: procuring resources and selling goods, setting prices for them, signing contracts, and so on. Entrepreneurship is associated with competition, whereas the latter is possible only if the quality of the products manufactured and the work and services performed increases continuously. Consequently, independence alone is not sufficient in this matter; participants in the economic interaction should use the achievements of scientific-technical thought and perfect the technology of production. The operation of transportation organs,

banks, and insurance establishments. In a market environment, the limited responsibility of, for example, transportation organizations to their clients and power-supply organizations to their partners is impermissible. Equal economic conditions, strict compliance with obligations under contracts, and full financial responsibility in the event of a failure to comply with them—such are the elementary requirements which should mark new relations. In a word, everything in them is interconnected and interdependent.

This is why the clear legal regulation of relations developing in the market is equally necessary to ensure the smooth operation of the economic mechanism in the market environment. In a federated state, its subjects should have genuine sovereignty; naturally, it is up to them to solve intrarepublic problems.

The market, which is considerably better equipped to solve the problem of overcoming the mutual alienation of the peoples than political actions, will become the connecting link which will ensure the unity of the Soviet state. Measures being taken at present by individual republics, oblasts, and even cities with a view to restricting the outshipment of goods would be considered unnatural in a market economy. Such a situation is entirely ruled out when consumers rather than producers dictate the terms of contracts.

We believe that this task may be accomplished by means of issuing the USSR Code of Civil Law. It has been mentioned above that civil law by its very nature is meant to regulate goods-and-money and asset relations. Its general provisions, the right of property, contract law, and the institutes regulating creative activities are, in essence, a creation of the market. However, in previous decades they were declarative, whereas now they should become significant as an efficient regulator of market relations.

With a view to attaining this goal, it is necessary, first, to completely revise and renew the corresponding institutions and civil-law norms and align them with the market; second, to envisage the comprehensive regulation of new economic relations on the basis and within the framework of the USSR Code of Civil Law. To be sure, a difficulty arises in approaching a solution to the problem in this manner—a certain lack of agreement with the existing system of Soviet law which is built along the lines of union fundamentals and republic codes. However, the market itself is a new phenomenon in our life, and this is why traditional solutions will hardly bring about desirable results in this sphere. The ethnic peculiarities of specific republics are expressed the least in the sphere of economic interaction; we may even say that in this sphere they do not exist at all. Therefore, objective prerequisites exist for creating a model of uniform legal regulation of the market relations on the entire territory of our country; the USSR Code of Civil Law may become the form of expressing this model.

However, is the USSR Code of Civil Law capable of embracing the entire multitude of economic relations? What is going to be the correlation of the code and other acts ensuring the implementation of an economic reform? The answer to the first question may be as follows: The code should regulate virtually all relations which develop in the market-economy system. Its legal norms should be designed in such a manner as to be sufficiently universal, that is, to ensure the discretion of participants in economic relations under the law, and at the same time the duty to comply with contracts, primarily observing conditions regarding quality, and full material responsibility in the event of violating obligations. We should not deem significant the number of articles which the code will end up having; it may be several hundred or, perhaps, about a thousand (there are more than 2,000 articles in the French civil code mentioned). It is important for the articles "to be operational," to effectively influence the emergence and development of the market relations.

Now about the second issue. As we see it, the code should accomplish a dual task: On the one hand, this is a direct-application law; it is necessary to proceed from it in considering specific economic issues. On the other hand, it should have the status of a fundamental document in developing other acts of our economic legislation. The possibility of the appearance of such acts cannot be ruled out due to the considerable variety of economic relations; moreover, we should proceed from the need to renew the republic civil codes as well. However, the correlation of norms devoted to the regulation of market ties should be such that Union legislation prevails. Thus, the USSR Code of Civil Law should be significant as the fundamental, focal document, and at the same time a direct-application law. A combination of these two features should ensure for it an opportunity to regulate relations developing in the market-economy sphere comprehensively and effectively.

Finally, the creation of fine-tuned civil legislation which takes into account the entire wealth of the past, our domestic experience, and the accomplishments of the legal regulation of contemporary market relations abroad are one of the most pressing problems which is more urgent than any other. This legislation should be in working condition by 1 January 1991 when, as we see, the market in our country becomes operational. In view of this, apart from the corresponding attitude and determination of the Supreme Soviet and its working organs, it would be expedient to set up a small working group, definitely a small one, of our prominent scientists, civil-law experts, without delaying it for even a day, give them the authority to enlist the help of all specialists and scientific collectives, and instruct them to produce a draft of the USSR Code of Civil Law as early as November or December.

We do not have another variant or alternative.

Mostovoy Views Changing Role of Gossnab

904A0428A RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian
13 Jun 90 p 1

[Report on interview with P. Mostovoy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA staff correspondent M. Martynov; place, date unspecified: "'Arrangers' Are Out of Place at the Fair"]

[Text] Journalists immediately christened an auction-fair which opened in Donetsk a merchandise exchange. There was a reason for it. The attributes of an exchange were obvious there: a crowd, an uproar, telephone negotiations with all cities of the country, transactions, and more transactions.... Representatives of all republic Gossnabs [State Committees for Material and Technical Supply] and territorial administrations of the organization came here, as well as more than 500 managers of production associations and large enterprises. All of them had the same goal—to purchase the products they need and sign delivery contracts for 1991.

P. Mostovoy, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gossnab, stressed in a conversation with a RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent:

[Mostovoy] This is a task of primary significance. As is known, next year will see a transition to market relations in the economy of our country. This means that centralized planning and the allocation of material resources will have to be replaced with wholesale trade and direct contacts. The successful operation of enterprises and organizations will depend to a decisive degree on the industriousness of their managers, economic sharpness, and the ability to conduct business in a thrifty manner and generate a profit. In this sense, the market will act as a harsh controller and the strictest examiner. Every manager has to understand this and rely on himself. The ministries will be deprived of an opportunity "to feed" those trailing behind at the expense of those working well.

[Martynov] What is going to happen to those who cannot make ends meet? After all, according to some data 15 percent of the enterprises in our country operate at a loss and up to 30 percent have low profit margins. Will all of them be really pronounced bankrupt and closed down?

[Mostovoy] Indeed, this is what is going to happen if everything is left to its own devices. The market does not tolerate enterprises operating at a loss. We should prepare properly, streamline production, improve the use of production capacity, prevent the loss of raw materials, energy, and other resources, and conduct commercial work skillfully in order to prevent the mass closure of economically weak enterprises. Our analysis shows that orders for resources in our country exceed actual needs by almost one-quarter. Such waste should be resolutely eliminated.

[Martynov] Pavel Ivanovich, at present many people are apprehensive about the transition to market relations entailing a price jump and, as a consequence, a drop in the standard of living. To what degree are such concerns justified?

[Mostovoy] This danger is real. The point is that there are approximately 1,600 monopoly enterprises in our country which control up to 80, 90, and even 100 percent of particular types of products. By Western standards, a company manufacturing 30 percent of a given product is considered to be a monopoly. Our monopolistic enterprises frequently dictate their terms to consumers even now, and after the transition to the market relations they will be tempted to enhance their well-being by jacking up prices.

However, prices are not the only point. Monopoly enterprises frequently ask for payment in kind for their products. For example, the Riga Bus Works demanded that residential homes be built in return for its vans. Certainly, this is not a market but rather a caricature of it. If we are going to take this road, then, say, the collective of a state farm will be required to pay amounts of milk, meat, and vegetables exceeding those it produces in return for agricultural machinery.

Antimonopoly legislation should provide protection against such arbitrariness. Obviously some enterprises and associations will have to be split, and the open and public signing of contracts at exchanges should be made the rule. The Donetsk fair-auction is prototype of such an exchange. We plan to set up such exchanges in various regions of the country.

[Martynov] However, in this case enterprise managers will be forced to travel around the country in search of the goods the suppliers needed. Will this not be too expensive?

[Mostovoy] Certainly this is unacceptable; if this were the case the entire profit generated may be spent on travel. A way out is known—creating a network of wholesale brokerage companies which will begin looking for suppliers and signing contracts, including on the foreign market. I believe that the Gosstab organizations can assume responsibility for this task. Why these organizations in particular? Because, first, our functions will change in the course of the transition to the market; we will have to make products available to the consumers rather than allocate them. Second, we have the most skilled cadres and extensive information on what is produced where. This is how I envision the new role of the Gosstab, which should be a locomotive pulling the train of our economy to the market.

Plight of Paper Producers Detailed

904A0428B Moscow *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 13 Jun 90 p 1

[Article by *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA* staff correspondent V. Noskov: "Brought to the Brink"]

[Text] Increasingly frequent disruptions of newspaper deliveries caused by a newsprint shortage justifiably outrage the people. Rightly so; after all, this shortage calls into doubt glasnost, the only indisputable accomplishment of perestroika. Who is to blame for the disruptions? Could it be that newsprint producers are? Our staff correspondent in Gorkiy Oblast V. Noskov went in search of an answer to this question to the Balakhna Pulp and Paper Combine, which furnishes its products to about one-third of the newspapers published in our country.

Having learned the purpose of my visit, Chief of the Plan-Economic Department L. Petushkova declared:

"These complaints should not be addressed to us. We exceeded the five-month plan for paper output by 1,500 tons. Look at our report data yourself."

I looked at them. Indeed, statistically everything appeared to be just fine: According to the five-month plan Balakhna was to furnish 189,700 tons, whereas 191,200 tons were produced. So, what was happening?

It turned out that the plan was for the combine to produce 16,800 tons less newsprint than last year in order to fill the state order (newsprint is only furnished to publishing houses under the order).

Deputy Director of the combine A. Stepanov explained: "This reduction is forced. On the whole, our plan was reduced only by 6,000 tons. Another 10,000 tons of newsprint which the publishing houses will not receive will be left at our disposal by the ministry. The sale of this newsprint will make it possible for us to secure funds for the reconstruction of the enterprise and to repair our equipment, which is more than 60 percent amortized. Otherwise, we will have to close the combine—we are already on the brink of this."

Indeed, the enterprise's situation is unenviable. It was built more than 60 years ago. Seven paper-making machines are in operation here, six of which have long outlived their usefulness; what they need is urgent replacement rather than repairs. However, the combine does not have funds, hard currency, for purchasing new machines. I will recall that paper-making equipment is not produced in our country. However, spare parts which can only be purchased abroad are also needed for repairs. Previously, as far back as the 1920s, Balakhna received equipment from the plants of America, England, Germany, and Austria. These countries are once again prepared to sell us such equipment, naturally, at a price. Alas, neither the enterprise itself nor the ministry have funds.

Managers of the enterprise apparently found a way out: They approached several American companies for credit. Overseas businessmen agreed to extend to them a loan of \$300 million. As is the requirement in such cases, a letter of intent was signed. The terms of debt repayment were also agreed upon. In general everything went well until the Americans asked Balakhna to find a guarantor to secure the transaction. In our country, only

one organization, the Bank for Foreign Economic Activity, can act as a guarantor. However, its management would not even talk to the "paper people."

The going got tough. Combine Director V. Lapukhin urgently went to Moscow and approached the deputy ministers of his parent Ministry of the Timber Industry. We beg you, could you please intercede on our behalf with the management of the bank? However, the deputy ministers did not take on this mission, pleading their workload. As they say in such cases, the country should know its "heroes": The names of the deputy ministers are I. Sankin and V. Chuyko.

The director had no other choice but to knock on a more formidable door. Its master, A. Chufistov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for the Chemical and Timber Complex, listened to the visiting supplicant attentively and expressed his compassion, but was not willing to intervene in the situation.

V. Lapukhin, who had just returned from the capital empty-handed, told me: "What is offensive is not that they refused to help us but that I had to act as a beggar, the fact that annually we export 120,000 tons of our products notwithstanding. Would it not be fair to let us keep at least one-half of the hard currency earned rather than the two percent which are left now?"

The question is quite legitimate. However, judging by the interview which Minister V. Melnikov gave to RAB-OCHAYA TRIBUNA on 8 June, they think otherwise in the headquarters of the industry. Supposedly, the collective of the combine will have three machines modernized anyway due to reducing the state order, and will obtain more than 100,000 tons of paper by virtue of this. Besides, according to the minister, Balakhna will purchase a new machine abroad which will yield another 200,000 tons of products.

There is no sufficiently firm foundation for the optimism of the head of the Ministry of the Timber Industry.

Let us begin with the fact that the new machine has got nothing to do with the current reduction in the state order. Its purchase and installation at the combine were authorized by a special order of the USSR Council of Ministers dating all the way back to 4 August 1988. The equipment has already been received, but its assembly is not proceeding satisfactorily. This is the assessment of V. Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who visited Balakhna personally in order to find out why the government's instruction is being poorly complied with. The responsibility for this devolves on the Ministry of the Timber Industry. Only one-tenth of the 22.3 million rubles-worth of assembly work has been done, the fact that the machine should be commissioned next year notwithstanding. It is already clear that its scheduled start-up will not occur at the appointed time: The combine will not cope with this alone.

...I asked to be present at a production meeting between the director and the chiefs of shops and departments. All

presentations began with a request: Spare parts are urgently needed; otherwise, machines could stop at any moment. The director was silent: There will be no spare parts without hard currency. The 10,000 tons which the combine was given at the expense of subscribers have yet to be produced and sold, and only after that may everything that is needed be purchased with the proceeds. This means that at best the machines can be repaired by the end of next year, and at worst this year, if the machines... break down themselves.

What about conclusions? The Balakhna combine, which has been brought to the brink by the administrative methods of management, is on its last legs. It needs emergency aid, funds, hard currency, and not for free, but as a loan. Foreign businessmen, the very "sharks of world capitalism," as we called them very recently, are prepared to extend this loan. Meanwhile, our countrymen, Soviet officials, heads of ministries and banks who are not asked to come up with a single ruble but merely with a guarantee (for our own people!), evade responsibility, and turn their backs not only on Balakhna but also on all subscribers. The very Soviet officials who have a duty to monitor the commissioning of the new machinery at the combine essentially boycott it.

How long do all of us have to wait before they are called to account for this, or before the issues of enterprise activities come to depend entirely on the capabilities of labor collectives rather than on the mood of officials? Who has an answer?

Gorbachev Message to Science, Industry Congress

PM2106074790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[Undated message from USSR President M.S. Gorbachev "To the Participants in the Constituent Congress of the USSR Science and Industry Union"]

[Text] Esteemed comrades!

I greet the participants in the constituent congress of the USSR Science and Industry Union. The union's bold and promising action program, which was put forward by a group of USSR People's Deputies, is in keeping with the revolutionary reforms which are currently being implemented in our country. The fact that this program has won the active support of many collectives of industrial enterprises, scientific organizations, and also the new type of social formations which have been established in the course of perestroika, indicates that this idea is timely and to the point and that it accords with the needs of life.

The road toward a regulated market economy on which we have embarked is a road toward the economic freedom of the producer and provides broad opportunities for everyone to realize their potential and talent and obtain deserved remuneration for labor. It provides

broad scope for efficiency and enterprise, competence and skill, and personal interest in and responsibility for the end result.

In these conditions the Science and Industry Union can and must make a weighty and authoritative contribution and become a real force in overcoming crisis phenomena, achieving the stabilization of the situation, and developing positive trends in the country's economy.

I wish you success in your work.

[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR

Scientific

'Cosmos-2083' Satellite Launched 19 Jun

LD2006072190 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT
20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The Cosmos-2083 satellite was launched on Tuesday in the Soviet Union by the Soyuz booster rocket. The satellite is intended to continue space research.

The satellite has been put into an orbit with the following parameters:

- Initial orbital period—88.7 minutes,
- maximum distance from the earth's surface—262 kilometers,
- minimum distance from the earth's surface—192 kilometers,
- orbital inclination—82.6 degrees.

The equipment is functioning normally.

New Unified Space Docking System Developed

LD2006095190 Moscow TASS in English 0942 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Soviet scientists and designers have developed a new unified docking system that could be used to dock the Soviet Mir orbital station with a U.S. space shuttle, Soviet cosmonaut Valeriy Kubasov told TASS.

In 1975, Kubasov participated in the Soviet-U.S. Soyuz-Apollo space programme. "The scientific aim of the joint flight was to test the rescue system for Soviet and U.S. spacecraft," he said.

"We tried to resolve the problem of docking spacecraft of various countries with different designs and technological systems. Soviet and U.S. specialists then developed the first unified docking device," Kubasov said.

Today, space is an area of international cooperation and security is a prime problem, Kubasov said. In the 15 years of Soviet-U.S. cooperation, the Soviet Union has

accumulated experience of docking spacecraft in orbit and the new docking system proves this, he said.

The new system considerably exceeds its 1975 predecessor's characteristics. It is lighter and smaller than the system used to dock Soyuz with Apollo. The new system is installed on the Kristall technological module which joined the Mir orbital complex on June 10.

Officials Visit Novaya Zemlya Test Site

904E0123A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 6 Jun 90 p 4

[Report on interview with Candidate of Technical Sciences G. Kaurov, chief of the Center For Public Information on Atomic Energy, by I. Yermakov: "Arctic Test Range: Entry Permitted"]

[Text] Representatives of Soviet authority visited the nuclear test range on the islands of Novaya Zemlya for the first time in its existence. Members of the USSR Government and employees of a number of ministries and departments also took part in the trip.

Candidate of Technical Sciences G. Kaurov, chief of the Center For Public Information on Atomic Energy, talks about the results of the inspection.

[Kaurov] The last explosion thundered on the Novaya Zemlya nuclear test range in October of last year. And later, as is known, after mass public protests, tests on ranges in the country were stopped. Now the USSR Supreme Soviet has to decide what to do further. Therefore, the people's deputies considered it necessary to visit the test site personally and to get objective information concerning its effect on the environment.

[Yermakov] Who took part in the trip, and how did it go?

[Kaurov] The interests of the legislative authority were represented by A. Vyucheykiy, A. Zolotkov, and A. Yemelyanenko, USSR people's deputies; A. Butorin, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy, and by A. Shpektor, a member of the Supreme Soviet of the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. The interests of the executive authority were represented by I. Belousov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V. Kononov, the USSR Minister of Atomic Energy and Industry; Admiral F. Gromov, commander of the Northern Fleet; P. Balakshin, chairman of the Archangel oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee], and Yu. Romanov, chairman of the Nenetskiy Okrug executive committee.

During the trip, we inspected one of the areas of the range and the epicenter areas of underground detonations. The deputies were familiarized with the results of measurements of radioactivity and even with their own hands conducted a check of the ground, reindeer moss, and snow cover with the help of individual dosimeters.

[Yermakov] What were the results?

[Kaurov] The variations in the values of the gamma background were in the range of eight to 15 microroentgens per hour. That is, they did not exceed the level in Moscow.

[Yermakov] Mistakes are excluded?

[Kaurov] The scientists working on the test range cited numerous data of measurements of the radioactivity of soil, mosses, lichens, grasses, various organs of northern reindeer and fish obtained in the period from 1960 to 1989. They are in no way different from similar measurements in Alaska.

[Yermakov] Do not the burial grounds of radioactive wastes constitute a danger for the region?

[Kaurov] This question also interested the people's deputies. But Vice Admiral G. Zolotukhin, chief of the directorate of the Soviet Navy, gave assurances: Radioactive wastes were not buried on the islands. USSR Minister Konovalov added that research is presently being conducted on the selection of the safest places for the construction of burial grounds.

[Yermakov] Did the deputies meet with the local population?

[Kaurov] And they inquired continuously whether they were concerned about the danger of local radioactive contamination. As a rule, the Novaya Zemlya inhabitants answered that they live and work on the islands without fear.

Military

Officers Command New Air Support Bases

PM2006141590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 13 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Major General of Aviation A. Konev, by correspondent Colonel A. Manushkin under the rubric "Interview on Reader's Letter"; date and place unspecified: "We Need These Bases!"—first three paragraphs are reader's letter and editorial introduction]

[Text] "Aviation technical bases (ATB) have been set up in the Air Force. The air regiment personnel who heard the news were hoping for the best: After all, it had been planned to appoint officers from among flight personnel to be the ATB commanders. However, all these hopes proved premature. Officers from rear-service subunits started being appointed.

"What has changed with respect to the creation of the bases? Nothing. It's just generated an organizational muddle. Currently our base, for instance, is working without a commander, a political officer deputy, or a chief of staff. One wonders just who needs these bases."

[Signed] Lieutenant Colonel V. Voronin

Our correspondent Colonel A. Manushkin familiarized Major General of Aviation A. Konev, deputy chief of directorate at the Air Force Main Staff, with this letter.

[Manushkin] Anatoliy Fedorovich, what prompted the need to set up ATB's?

[Konev] Their creation should be viewed in the context of Air Force restructuring, which is aimed at improving the combat training of air units and subunits. The defensive nature of present-day Soviet military doctrine forces us to actively improve the structure of Air Force units and subunits with a view to ensuring the more effective resolution of their missions.

Why were ATB's set up? The fact is that they have important missions. It is planned that ATB's will provide flight support for virtually any kind of aircraft. What is the benefit? Suppose a regiment is flying to another airfield (for training purposes, for instance). It will take along with it a "trail" of trucks in several convoys.

The creation of base flight support services eliminates the need to refuel a large amount of ground-based equipment en route. The resolution of this problem will not only have a favorable impact on combat readiness. Materials will be saved, equipment durability improved, and so forth. Incidentally, the Americans have long had such bases.

One other important point. Previously there were two people at air bases in charge of providing support services for air units. These were the commander of the separate airfield technical support battalion (OBATO) and the commander of the separate communications and electronic support battalion (OBS RTO). We are now creating a single entity—the airfield technical base (ATB)—out of these two subunits.

[Manushkin] Does that mean that Lt. Col. Voronin's opinion was subjective?

[Konev] Undoubtedly. A study of opinions at air support regiments and units has shown that most airmen favor the creation of ATB's. The fact that there have been certain shortcomings and problems is another matter. Any organizational changes involving staffing cause difficulties with the selection and placement of cadres and their reassignment.

[Manushkin] But the letter-writer says that it was decided that ATB commanders would be drawn from among flight personnel, whereas in practice the posts have been taken by support subunit officers. He sees behind this machinations by the leaders of the Air Force rear services....

[Konev] It's not a question of machinations. The point is that the earnings of, for instance, an air regiment commander and an ATB commander are significantly different. The USSR Defense Ministry Central Financial Directorate would not agree to increase the pay of the latter. This resulted in a situation whereby air regiment

commanders and deputy commanders would be unwilling to take on the duties of ATB commander when their flying careers were over. That is why it was decided as a temporary measure to appoint as base commanders officers from among the best-trained rear-service and communications specialists. Currently, for instance, those who have been appointed ATB commanders include former pilots, rear-service specialists, and communications specialists. Things have been going best in places where the leader and the personnel have understood the role and mission of the newly formed bases.

Draft Concept of Military Reform Proposed

90UM0653A Kiev LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA in Russian
24 Apr 90 p 2

["Draft concept presented by group of USSR people's deputy officers: 'How To Reform the Army?'"]

[Text] Dear Editors,

For several months now various newspapers and journals have been writing about a draft concept of military reform drawn up by a group of USSR people's deputies in conjunction with military scientists and disseminated as an official document at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. Various assessments of this concept and even pressure on its authors have been reported. And here we have one latest piece of news: Academician Ye. Velikhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Armed Forces Subcommittee for Defense and State Security, has submitted a petition concerning encouragement of the most active developers of the concept of reform in the Army. But why has the text of this sensational document not been published anywhere; is it secret? Perhaps this could be undertaken by LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA?

[Signed] Major I. Tyurin.

From the editors: No, this concept contains no secrets. We publish below the text made available to us by Guards Major V. Yerokhin, people's deputy of the USSR. We hope that readers of LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA will voice their opinions on it.

I. Need for Military Reform

The positive changes in the world, the affirmation of the new political thinking, and revolutionary restructuring in the country are demanding an in-depth transformation of the defenses and Armed Forces of the USSR.

The contradictoriness of the development of the international situation and the continuation of the military danger presuppose the presence of a strong, high-quality army. The state of the USSR Armed Forces, however, does not correspond to the command of the times, and the measures which are being adopted are of a cosmetic nature and prevent the army being brought to a new quality level, which was reflected in concentrated fashion in the course of the "Afghan campaign." Military

reform encompassing all spheres of defense building is essential to achieve this goal.

The objective need for military reform is dictated by a number of profound contradictions:

between the requirements of a dependable armed defense taking account of the level of the actual danger of war and the continuing traditional approach to a solution of problems of defense capability thanks to quantity to the detriment of quality;

between the profound structural transformations in society and the lagging of such transformations in the Armed Forces on account of the absence of a real concept of their restructuring;

between the original purpose of the socialist army and its use in a sphere which is not its domain owing to the absence of clear-cut legal regulation of the relations of the army and society;

between the high national significance of the army for the country and the decline in its prestige in connection with the unfortunate state of the material and social amenity support for the servicemen and members of their families, which is causing reduced interest in service, a growth of social apathy among the officers, and a mass aspiration to break with their profession, and also on account of the negative processes in the Armed Forces (the flowering of protectionism and military bureaucracy, the deaths and maiming of personnel in peace time, and the mockery and abuse);

between the goals of education in the process of military service and the preparation therefor of the citizen-soldier, given the qualitative change in the draft contingent, and the conservative system of education and the evolved mechanism of suppression of the personality.

II. Basic Principles of Military Reform

An analysis of the sum total of factors determining the content and development prospects of the country's defenses makes it possible to formulate the basic principles of military organizational development designed to constitute the basis for the elaboration of military reform. These should include:

1. Effective leadership of the entire sphere of the country's defenses and the subordination of the military department to the highest state elective authorities and society as a whole, given complete glasnost and the maximum possible openness.

2. Correspondence of the structure of the Armed Forces, the priority directions of the development of equipment and arms, and the financing of military organizational development to the level of the actual military danger and defense sufficiency.

3. Preferential orientation toward qualitative characteristics of defense and military organizational development and the staged professionalization of the army.

4. The personal interest of each citizen in the high-quality accomplishment of the country's defense assignments.
5. Democratization of the entire military organization of society in accordance with the principles of a law-based state and rules of international law.
6. Consideration of national-historical traditions and progressive experience of modern military organizational development.

III. Content of Military Reform

1. The activity of the state and its bodies and departments and society as a whole geared to cardinal transformations in the sphere of defense building in accordance with a uniform legal enactment (law) incorporating general provisions, organization, and methods of manpower acquisition of the Armed Forces, the procedure of military service by USSR citizens, and questions of leadership of the military sphere constitute the basis of the content of military reform.

2. The main idea of the reform is staged transition to a cadre, regular army staffed on a professional volunteer basis.

To find the budget appropriations for such an army thanks to a significant reduction in arms, the strength of the personnel of the Armed Forces and the number of military training institutions, and the creation of the optimum, economical system of training military personnel; a change in the table of organization job assignment structure of the organs of administration; an expansion of the use in the army and navy of civilian specialists; elimination of the shadow military economy; standardization of civilian and military production; elimination of the costly privileges for senior command personnel; and so forth.

To accomplish transition to a professional army in stages, beginning with the strategic missile and landing forces (including the corresponding formations of the navy and air force, airborne forces, and naval assault landing formations), then the ground forces and air defense forces. For the purpose of training reserves to utilize forms of the territorial-police system created on the basis of DOSAAF [All-Union Volunteer Society for Assistance to the USSR Army, Air Force, and Navy] training subunits. To provide in the reform for a new organizational and manning structure of the Armed Forces designed to ensure the conditions for an improvement in the training of the troops for conducting combat operations, to exclude use of the army for functions which are not within its province, and to eliminate the military construction and railroad forces as a labor army.

3. To change control of the Armed Forces, ensuring the real participation of the whole of society in the implementation of military policy and the principles, paths, and methods of defense building. The top leadership of this sphere should be made over to the Congress of

USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the government. Questions of the building, improvement, and financing and expenditure of the military budget and the training of the Armed Forces should be discussed annually at the congresses of people's deputies and by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The role of the CPSU should be determined by the transition from direct substitution for organs of the state in the leadership of defense to the winning of public recognition of the right to be the exponent of the collective intellect and the elaboration of a modern Marxist-Leninist vision of the problems of war and peace and the defense of socialism setting reference points for the people and the army in this sphere. This will require a reduction in the number and manning level of the political authorities and the introduction of their electivity and a reorientation of work toward elevation of the personality of the soldier and his protection.

4. To provide for a fundamental reorientation of the organs of administration of the Defense Ministry and other ministries connected with defense and the removal from their structure of intermediate and duplicative components.

5. To humanize the army and change the position of the personality of the serviceman and the conservative-exclusive nature of intra-army practices and the tenor of barracks life; ensure the civic equality of servicemen and their social protection; create specific mechanisms for the protection of their personality, promote the establishment of the principles of justice and sole responsibility on a legal basis, and examine in a package all legislative enactments, rules, regulations, and instructions along the lines of the creation of genuinely socialist, democratic relations in the multinational military collectives, and create the conditions for the active incorporation of the entire personnel in the political life of the country and the Armed Forces on the basis of legal support for extensive glasnost and a healthy moral and psychological atmosphere.

IV. Ways and Methods of the Accomplishment of Military Reform

For the purpose of the accomplishment of military reform:

1. To lift the secrecy from questions of military organizational development, tell the whole truth about the state of the defenses and the army, and in conjunction with the people discuss urgent problems of perestroika in the defense sphere.
2. To elaborate an integral concept of perestroika and a comprehensively targeted program conforming thereto of the development of the reform with the participation of the top scientific forces of the country and the Armed Forces.
3. On the basis of the comprehensively targeted program to draw up a plan of military reform and the bills

connected therewith and to submit them following discussion in their first reading at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet for discussion by the army and navy community and the entire people.

4. Following approval of this document at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to complete by 1991 all the constitutional work and embark on its realization.

KGB Border Guards' Chief Discusses State Border

PM3105104590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 May 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Colonel General I. Kalinichenko, chief of the USSR KGB Border Guards, by Colonel R. Makushin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA News Desk editor, pegged to Border Guards Day; place, date not specified: "Together With the People We Can Guarantee Reliable Protection of the USSR State Border"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] This headline expresses one of the fundamental theses posited by Lieutenant General I. Kalinichenko, chief of the USSR KGB Border Guards, in a conversation with Colonel R. Makushin, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA News Desk editor.

[Makushin] Ilya Yakovlevich, I met you exactly two years ago, on the eve of Border Guards Day. How do you assess the situation on the USSR state border today?

[Kalinichenko] In a word, these are troubled times on our border. All the events taking place in the country immediately have a direct effect on the state border, whether we like it or not. I have in mind economic, political, and national relations. Events in the Baltic states, Moldavia, the Transcaucasus, and other regions show that serious changes are needed in our attitude toward border security. From the point of view of the men, equipment, and weapons we are using at the moment, from the point of view of our directives for working with the local population and involving it in guarding the border, and finally, from the point of view of collaboration with local party and soviet organs and law enforcement organs.

[Makushin] Apparently we can now talk about the fact that here and there relations between the local population and the Border Guards have changed, and they have not changed for the better.

[Kalinichenko] Of course, events on the Azerbaijan border have shown that an extreme situation, like the one prevailing there, can be provoked not just by a neighboring state but even by our own side, as it were. Incited by the People's Front and stirred up by nationalists, people have committed—I have no hesitation in using this word—crimes.

[Makushin] Did you not expect such a turn of events?

[Kalinichenko] To be honest, we might have expected an outburst of that kind there, but not on such a scale.... Of course, this was a surprise to us to a certain extent.

[Makushin] We believe that the border is guarded by the whole people. In view of what you have said, has your attitude toward this changed?

[Kalinichenko] We maintain the same position. That is the only way, there is no alternative. No reinforcements, no additional men, equipment, or weapons will help us to successfully perform our tasks if we exclude the people from guarding the border. But I simply cannot consider a mob of fanatics as the people.

[Makushin] There is another side to this question: Again in connection with recent events, has there been a change of the attitude of Border Guards personnel toward their service?

[Kalinichenko] Yes, if you like, it has. These changes have involved increased responsibility. For instance, during the events in the Transcaucasus, the number of breaches of discipline sharply decreased among the troops, the Border Guards' vigilance increased, and so on. People rose to the task.

[Makushin] What does the situation in this region look like now?

[Kalinichenko] The situation is complex. Of course, the border is reliably guarded, but violators trying to cross the border in either direction are detained here every day. Sometimes we have to use our weapons, and there are cases of people breaking through onto our side, and then we carry out a search and neutralize the violators. In a word, tension is not decreasing at the moment.

[Makushin] And so, the Border Guards have risen to the task. But does that mean all of them everywhere? For example, the phenomenon of desertion has become noticeable in the Armed Forces. It is common mainly among soldiers from the Baltic Republics. Has this process affected the Border Guards, for instance?

[Kalinichenko] There are isolated incidents. I could easily count them on the fingers of both hands. Some of these fugitives were brought back by their parents.

[Makushin] Do you believe that the most serious sector of the border today is in the Transcaucasus, the border with Iran? Or are there other hotbeds as we say?

[Kalinichenko] It is not easy to answer a question about the most complex sector of the border at the moment. But all the same, I would describe the western border as the most crucial today. This is the border with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Romania. And here is the reason. The stream of people who flooded into East Europe in connection with the events in those countries, undoubtedly affects us too. For instance, some Italian tourists went to Poland, set up camp there, traveled around, got lost, and wandered up to the border. Fine, these are tourists, but who can vouch that others will not

cross our border with aims that have nothing to do with tourism.... A complex situation. The situation also remains complex along the Azerbaijan-Iran sector, it is also complex along the Afghan border. The Afghan "implacables" are trying to extend their activity onto our territory and clashes occur—we lost a soldier in one of them recently. Eighteen people were detained but one of ours died.... The situation remains complex also on the Kuril Islands....

[Makushin] And what is going on there?

[Kalinichenko] Japanese fishermen are continuing to literally plunder our natural resources there. They are economic violators of the border, so to speak.

[Makushin] Is the situation along the western border somehow connected with the processes taking place in the Baltic republics?

[Kalinichenko] No. Not yet. And nevertheless, growing numbers of tasks face those who guard the western border. For instance, the USSR president recently signed two new decrees on Latvian and Estonian legislative acts that contradict the USSR Constitution. I think that this will provoke a certain reaction on the border.

[Makushin] Ilya Yakovlevich, what do you consider to be the main problem for Border Guards now?

[Kalinichenko] I would say that there are several such problems. The main one is to elaborate a new concept for the guarding of the state border as soon as possible, in order to submit it to the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions and the USSR KGB. Then it will lay the foundation for the troops' further development.

[Makushin] Could you briefly outline its essence?

[Kalinichenko] The essence is as follows: To organize the guarding of the state border in such a way that, using the men, equipment, and weapons at the Border Guards' disposal, it becomes a reliable frontier defending the interests of our socialist society and state.

[Makushin] In other words, without increasing the number of people on the border and without increasing the quantity of technical resources and so on?

[Kalinichenko] No, no. Please do not misunderstand me. Once we calculate the cost of this concept, we will be able to say what we need and what we do not need. From a military point of view, it is difficult to guard a border like ours with a force of 200,000 men. Our second problem is to reorganize the structure of the Border Guards in accordance with the concept so that every link is as efficient as possible in guarding the border. The third task, which must be resolved as soon as possible, is legal and social protection for servicemen. Well, for example, some laws recently adopted in the Baltic states put our officers and warrant officers and their families in what you might call an ambiguous position.

[Makushin] When do you intend to present the new concept?

[Kalinichenko] We will report at year's end.

[Makushin] Ilya Yakovlevich, thank you for the conversation. On behalf of the KRASNAYA ZVEZDA collective and its readers, allow me to congratulate all the border guards on their holiday and wish them success in their service.

[Kalinichenko] Thank you.

Baltic Republics

Ryzhkov Awaiting Lithuanian Move on Proposal

LD2006222790 Vilnius International Service
in English 2130 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] There have been no new developments in Lithuania as to the moratorium on the independence act. But, as is reported by the INTERFAX agency in Moscow, the Soviet Premier, Nikolay Ryzhkov, has expressed astonishment that no special meeting of Lithuanian parliament had been convened to discuss the issue. The Soviet Government is patiently waiting, Nikolay Ryzhkov said.

Meanwhile, reports of foreign news agencies say that influential circles in the United States are also astonished that Lithuania is not willing, as they put it, to reach a compromise with Moscow.

In his turn the Lithuanian envoy to Washington and the Holy See, Stasys Lozoraitis, said on Radio Free Europe, that the moratorium raises for him a lot of vague points while the blockade of Lithuania complicates the situation even more. According to Stasys Lozoraitis, Moscow's first step should be lifting the blockade. He also pointed out that Moscow had given a verbal proposal to declare a moratorium as a means to start dialogue, while history gave evidence enough that Moscow's word could not be trusted fully.

Commission on Drawing Up Treaties Meets

LD2006221790 Vilnius International Service
in English 2130 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] The first sitting of the commission for drawing up treaties with the Soviet Union was held at the Lithuanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs today. The sitting was headed by the foreign minister, Algirdas Saudargas.

It was agreed that the final result of talks with the Soviet Union would be a bilateral treaty. But most of the members of the commission noted that the final goal would take much time and effort to achieve.

The commission is to meet each Wednesday and the next meetings will be devoted to considering possible interim stages which Lithuania might find itself in while consolidating its independence de facto.

Today's discussion dealt with future treaties on frontiers, the economy, protection of the country, and some other issues.

Vilnius Radio Carries 20 June Supreme Council

Minorities Discussed

LD2006142390

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1200 GMT on 20 June begins to carry live the Lithuanian Supreme Council plenary session in Vilnius.

At 1202 GMT the presenter states that Presidium members are just completing their meeting and the session will start shortly.

At 1203 GMT the session opens, chaired by Deputy Abisalas. He says that debates on the Vilnius rayon leadership's decision will continue.

At 1213 GMT a deputy complains that no schools have been built in the parts of Lithuania populated by Poles. In his opinion representatives of national minorities should take part in the Committee for National Minorities' work. A special commission should be set up to deal with the Polish-speaking population's affairs.

At 1221 GMT Deputy Valentina Suboc asks for permission to speak in her native language—Polish. Deputy Benas Rupeika agrees to act as an interpreter. She stresses that her parents and grandparents were born on Lithuanian soil, and she herself has been working here all her life. She would like to work for the benefit of all citizens—Lithuanians, Poles, and Russians. Not a single elector in her constituency bears any grudges against the Lithuanians as people. Her electors want Poles and Lithuanians to act together and work together for the benefit of their homeland—Lithuania. But they all must be equal. Hitherto disagreements have been caused by a failure to solve social and economic problems.

At 1239 GMT Deputy Abisalas announced that eleven more deputies are on the list of those who wish to speak on this issue and asks them to shorten their speeches and, if possible, submit concrete proposals. A deputy who wants to speak Polish and cannot find an interpreter, refuses to speak in Lithuanian.

At 1242 GMT Deputy Rudys thinks that everything should be done so that deputies and ordinary people can speak in state institutions in their native tongue. He deals in general terms with Polish-Lithuanian relations without mentioning the issue of the Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons.

At 1253 GMT a deputy explains that the present situation in Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons have been initiated by the pro-Moscow Lithuanian Communist Party. Poles enjoy a better life and better conditions in Lithuania than anywhere else.

At 1307 GMT deputies ask the speaker questions about the tuition conditions at schools, especially vis-a-vis teaching the Polish language. A heated discussion starts on Polish-Lithuanian relations.

At 1312 GMT the next speaker complains that the present Lithuanian leadership is neglecting Polish interests in the Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons. There is discrimination against the use of the Polish language.

At 1324 GMT a deputy dwells on the history of Polish-Lithuanian relations. From a legal view point there cannot be territorial autonomy in eastern Lithuania. The present Poland has no territorial claims on Lithuania.

At 1333 GMT the session adjourns until 1405 GMT.

Rayon Decision Debated

LD2006164490

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1405 GMT on 20 June continues to carry live the Lithuanian Supreme Council plenary session in Vilnius.

A Polish representative, Iwaszko, states that certain decisions taken by the Vilnius and Salcininkai Rayons are unconstitutional and the Supreme Council could declare them void, but this will not solve the problem. The solution must be found by both Poles and Lithuanians.

At 1408 GMT a representative of the Vilnius Rayon, Klimas, complains that the eastern Lithuanian Council has no support from the Supreme Council which has not examined various proposals submitted to it to solve this problem. In his opinion, a coalition local government should be set up in these rayons.

At 1416 GMT the chairman of the Vilnius Rayon Council states that during the last week nobody from the government or the Supreme Council has visited the rayon, there has not even been a telephone call from any authority. People engaged in agriculture are neglected in the rayon, their needs are being ignored. The number of schools teaching in Polish has substantially declined.

At 1429 GMT an unidentified orator speaking in Russian maintains that the decisions by the Vilnius Rayon were dictated by the will of the electors. The debate continues.

At 1459 GMT some points from the draft resolution by the Supreme Council on territorial autonomy are read out but the details are indistinct.

At 1537 GMT an indistinct draft resolution is read and a vote taken.

At 1542 GMT there is another vote on an item in the draft resolution and on plans to set up a state commission to deal with the issue. The results of the voting are indistinct.

At 1552 GMT the live relay ends.

Vilnius Rayon Council Decision Overturned

LD2006213890 Vilnius International Service
in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] The Lithuanian Supreme Council held a plenary sitting today. It continued the examination of a decision of the Vilnius Rayon Council, adopted almost one month ago, proclaiming this rayon as Polish national rayon. This is part of the so-called problem of Polish autonomy.

Today's discussion in parliament, with the participation of the eastern Lithuanian representatives, non-deputies, both Polish and Lithuanians, could be called fierce.

According to a decision of the Supreme Council, a state commission was instructed to examine the situation in the Vilnius Rayon and submit its proposals to the Supreme Council. The decision of the Vilnius Rayon Council was proclaimed invalid and legally ineffective.

State Commission Formed

LD2006231590 Moscow TASS in English 2248 GMT
20 Jun 90

[Text] Vilnius June 21 TASS—The session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet was preoccupied with only one issue on Wednesday: the May 24 decision of the Vilnius Regional Soviet of People's Deputies, especially its second item proclaiming the Polish National-Territorial District of the same name on the territory of the Vilnius region, within Lithuania.

A resolution passed by the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet after a four-hour debate declared the decision of the Vilnius Regional Soviet as legally ungrounded, and not having any consequences.

The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet instructed its Presidium to form a State Commission which, jointly with representatives of local government bodies, will analyse before October 1 all the issues set forth in the documents adopted at the session and submit its conclusions to the Supreme Soviet.

Lithuania's Prunskiene Interviewed in Athens

PM2006155190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Nikolayev dispatch: "K. Prunskiene's Visit to Greece"]

[Text] Athens—K. Prunskiene, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, has arrived in Athens on an official visit at the invitation of the newspaper KATHIMERINI. This visit "will enable us to take one more step toward strengthening Lithuania's burgeoning statehood in a European context," the head of the Lithuanian government said in a brief statement at Athens Airport. "We hope to launch Lithuania's relations with Greece, and to have the opportunity of meeting the country's leadership and of using yet one more tribune in the West to clarify our situation and our intentions."

What precisely does the head of the Lithuanian government want to bring to a Western audience's attention? Answering this question, K. Prunskiene said that trips to the West "help us to keep tabs on our position. For example, to what extent are the steps taken by Lithuania in line with development processes throughout Europe and, moreover, throughout the world. Because the world defines some of the boundaries and the field of action for

Lithuania, and this must be taken into consideration. During my very first visits, and especially following my visit to Canada, the United States, and West Europe, I clearly understood how interlinked all this is. And now that we have entered what I would describe as a new phase in our relations with the Soviet Union, which is already channeling efforts toward a solution of the conflict and the removal of tension, it is extremely important to check our steps against the way the world perceives them and assesses the extent to which they are correct and productive."

"Does your arrival in Athens mean that you have specific plans for the development of bilateral relations with Greece?" IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked K. Prunskiene.

"That depends on how the projected meetings, including the meeting with Greek government representatives, turn out. The only path from South to North into the Scandinavian countries leads directly through Lithuania. I think that Lithuania's geopolitical position will play an important part in both East-West and South-North relations in future."

[Nikolayev] Movement is now noticeable in the dialogue between Moscow and Vilnius. What would you say in this connection?

[Prunskiene] We expect movement, and we ourselves expect to be taking certain steps. As you know, the Lithuanian government submitted to the republican parliament a proposal to declare a moratorium on the 11 March act on the restoration of independence for the period of the talks, expressing trust in the Soviet Union's leadership and hoping that this will not be exploited in any way to unilaterally infringe Lithuania's interests. We intend to bring about the start of a dialogue so that, during these talks and taking the Soviet Union's interests into account, our statehood could be genuinely restored following a certain transitional period.

Report From Lithuania on Problem of Deserters

PM1806105190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 15 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Our correspondent report under "Direct Line" rubric: "Who Will Foot the Bill?"]

[Text] Lithuania—A lean youth of average height was sitting in the office of Major of Justice V. Zaychenko, deputy military prosecutor of Vilnius garrison. Having arrived on leave, he had risen to the bait thrown by members of the Lithuanian commission for military service affairs, and had not returned to his unit on time. And now, having realized the shakiness of the Lithuanian parliament's assurances, he had come to the military prosecutor's office...

Such an occurrence is not unique. Many youths, after coming up against reality in Lithuania, have understood the utter irresponsibility of parliamentarians who had

promised to take them under their wing. Now many of them are even resorting to various subterfuges. Thus, Private D. Chebotaruskas was forced to get to his place of service in the Transcaucasus Military District from his native Kaunas via... Riga.

But, unfortunately, the Vilnius garrison military prosecutor's office has many cases of desertion to investigate. Specifically, against Seaman G. Payaris, who went AWOL from his unit 14 March, and against military construction workers Privates S. Shesnulyavichus, A. Orzhekauskas, R. Chyurlenis, and A. Gumulyauskas. Military investigators come from their units for each case and the Ministry of Defense incurs losses.

"It would be fairer," Major of Justice V. Zaychenko says, "if all expenses were reimbursed by the government of the republic which has made an anticonstitutional decision in relation to Lithuanian youths..."

The military prosecutor's offices of Vilnius and other garrisons are giving all the assistance they can in searching for the deserters. But sometimes even judge advocates are powerless.

Report on Lithuanian Green Party Congress

LD1806011490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1700 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Summary] The first congress of the Greens Party of Lithuania ended in Vilnius today.

The leadership of the party will consist of 14 people. The current political situation was assessed by the congress and several resolutions were adopted.

Romualdas Juknys from Kaunas, who was elected one of the three elders of the Council of the Lithuanian Greens Party, said that the agenda of the congress had been practically exhausted: the main task achieved was that the program and statute of the party had been confirmed, which means that the party can start functioning.

Speaking of the political orientation of the Lithuanian Greens, R. Juknys said that they emerged as a political and ecological force of Sajudis, and had now developed into a party, therefore, the same orientation would remain. He said that it seemed that the Greens would be closer to Christian Democrats and not the left-wing forces. R. Juknys said that Lithuanian Greens would stand for adherence to the Act of Independence and any kind of suspension or freezing of the act would be opposed by the Greens because they believe this would mean rescinding statehood.

Lithuanian Association of Homeless People Meets

LD1606172590 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1326 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Vilnius, 16 Jun (ELTA-TASS)—Twenty percent of Lithuania's inhabitants are homeless. That is the opinion of those who took part in the first republican

conference of the association of the republic's homeless people, which took place in Vilnius today. After all, according to the organization's status, people who live in hostels, in semi-basements, and in other lodgings that are unadapted to living conditions and do not respond to sanitary and hygienic standards, adult children who share their lodging with their parents and who are deprived of the right to have their own apartment are considered to be homeless citizens.

The aim of this public organization, which was set up six months ago, is to protect the most socially insecure groups of the population. A great reserve in resolving this problem is the construction of individual houses, for the construction of which in the capital of Lithuania 8,000 applications were submitted, however, at the present time the capacity the building industry has can satisfy the applications of only 400 people.

Participants in the conference suggested that the Lithuanian Association of Homeless People should have an opportunity to take part in working out and creating all new documents on housing, and should cooperate with the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Commission on Social Issues.

Proceedings at Estonian Party Congress Viewed

LD2006135790 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1250 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Tallinn, 20 June. (TASS)—The 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress continued work here today.

As is well known, the congress opened in March and a split occurred. Some of the delegates approved the draft platform for the reorganization of the Estonian Communist Party, favoring the proclamation of a transitional period and the creation of an independent Estonian Communist Party. Others—around 140 delegates—supported the idea of organizational unity with the CPSU. After the congress had officially closed, these delegates remained in the hall and decided to form their own leading bodies. They also adopted a decision by which the delegates' authority is prolonged for up to six months and there will be a break in the work of the congress.

Today's agenda included questions concerning the situation in the Estonian Communist Party, the party's action program, changes and additions to the draft CPSU regulations, the convening of the next congress of the Estonian Communist Party, which will be the 21st and other matters.

Aleksandr Gusev, secretary of the central committee of the Estonian Communist Party, who favours organizational and ideological unity with the CPSU, delivered a report on the first three points of the agenda.

The congress is continuing its work.

Estonian Party Secretary Interviewed on Situation

LD2006165790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] The 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress, adhering to ideological and organizational unity with the CPSU, continued its work in Tallinn today. Here is reportage by our correspondent Heimar Lenk:

[Lenk] The 20th Estonian Communist Party Congress opened last March. The decision on setting up an independent Estonian Communist Party was adopted by a majority vote at it. Some delegates, mainly representatives of the party committees of large industrial enterprises of Union subordination, however, continued work after the congress closed and elected their own party Central Committee. The Central Committee comes out for unity with the CPSU. Delegates of this section of the Estonian communists gathered today to continue the work of the 28th congress. Pavel Panfilov, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, agreed to a brief interview in the interval:

[Begin recording] [Panfilov] As you have seen, we have had a report which analyzed the situation in the Estonian Communist Party after the initial period, and now we will start discussing issues of preparations for the 28th congress.

[Lenk] And what exactly is the situation in the Estonian Communist Party now?

[Panfilov] Well, the situation is fairly complex and alarming. The greatest difficult is that there is no clarity as, say, in Latvia and Lithuania. This transitional period that has come about here, the double membership—in the CPSU and the issuing of cards of the independent Estonian Communist Party—have confused many people. Therefore, today's continuation of the congress is to make delimitations and concepts more clear to Estonian Communists in this respect. We will adopt yet another decision today, namely on holding the 21st congress, but this will be after the 28th congress. Then reports-back and elections will have been held in the primary party organizations as is customary in our party, and we will come to the 21st congress as an organizational unit. [end recording]

Estonian Communists Warn of Revival of Fascism

LD2006215390 Moscow TASS in English 2133 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Tallinn June 21 TASS—Estonian communists who favour the organisational and ideological unity with the Soviet Communist Party went on record on Wednesday in favour of the preservation and consolidation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the principles of a renewed union treaty. This stand was put forward in a declaration of the Communist Party of

Estonia on the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Estonia, adopted at the 20th party congress.

The congress of the Estonian Communist Party, that ended on Wednesday, began last March. A split took place there at that time. Part of the delegates announced the creation of an independent republican communist party. The other part—some 140 delegates—supported the idea of maintaining organizational unity with the Soviet Communist Party. After the congress was officially closed, those delegates remained in the hall, formed the party's leading authorities and postponed the congress until last Wednesday.

Delegates to the congress expressed concern over acts of vandalism with regard to the graves of Soviet soldiers who were killed during the liberation of Estonia from Nazis, which became more frequent of late. Communists expressed strong protest against the "World Congress of Estonians—Participants in the Liberation Struggle", which is planned to be held in the Parnu district. Veterans of the Estonian 20th SS Division and Omakaite units are expected to attend it. The congress urged the republican and the USSR Supreme Soviets, as well as all progressive public, to prevent the revival of fascism.

Estonian Premier Holds Talks in Netherlands

LD1606114890 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian
1700 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Yesterday Edgar Savisaar held talks with Netherlands Prime Minister Rudolf Lubbers. During the conversation, which lasted several hours, ideas were exchanged about widening contacts between Netherlands and Estonia in various fields. The political situation in Estonia and in the Baltic republics was discussed. The discussion on these subjects was continued at the dinner with Mrs. (Prover Porf), mayor of [name indistinct] town.

According to what Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar said in a telephone interview, his welcome has been heartfelt everywhere, and interest in the Estonian issues great. This attitude was evident also at yesterday's press conference in which foreign minister Lennart Meri also participated.

Latvian Interior Minister Views Moscow Talks

LD2006215690 Riga International Service in Latvian
1730 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Aloizs Vaznis, the new Latvian minister of internal affairs, returned to Riga yesterday after a two-week visit to Moscow. He had several meetings there with USSR Internal Affairs Minister Bakatin, in which they discussed the question of future cooperation in matter-of-fact talks.

The all-Union minister has endorsed our republican Supreme Soviet resolution on the election of Aloizs

Vaznis. Moscow is no longer displaying its former commanding pressure but is interested in constructive joint work. The new minister acknowledges that he feels comfortable in his elevated position and is prepared to carry out the duties set by the Latvian parliament with persons of like-minded opinions. [passage omitted]

Latvian Chief Supports Gorbachev More Than Party

AU1706193090 Paris AFP in English 1644 GMT
17 Jun 90

[Text] Riga, June 17 (AFP)—A majority of Soviet citizens support President Mikhail Gorbachev's plan to transform the Soviet Union into a free-market economy and a federation of sovereign states, Latvian President Anatolijs Gorbunov said here Sunday.

"President Gorbachev has made two attractive propositions, a switch to a free market and a federation of independent states, to which there are no other alternatives," Mr. Gorbunov said in an interview with the Agence France-Presse news agency.

But if the Soviet leader enjoys the support of most Soviet citizens, he "does not have the same degree of support within his party apparatus," said the 48-year-old Latvian leader, relaxing this weekend in shirt sleeves at his country house.

Mr. Gorbunov, a former construction engineer trained by the Communist Party in Moscow during the 1970s, is considered the most moderate of the three Baltic presidents. He is still a Communist Party member and does not adhere to the nationalist Latvian Popular Front.

Complaining of the limited powers accorded Latvia's president, Mr. Gorbunov said his function was "merely to maintain contact between the parliament and the government."

Mr. Gorbunov has been criticised in recent days by Latvian nationalists in parliament for having proposed negotiations with the Soviet Union on the legal status of Latvia during a transition period towards an independent state.

The Latvian parliament has still not responded to Mr. Gorbachev's proposal that the three Baltic states Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia suspend their unilateral declarations of independence pending top-level negotiations with Moscow.

On the subject of the proposed moratorium, Mr. Gorbunov said: "I do not know. I want to see it spelled out clearly before I comment." He added that the Latvian government is due Monday to introduce a bill on the subject.

On the topic of the Soviet federation of sovereign states, Mr. Gorbunov said Latvia "must be independent first, and then we'll deal with other questions later."

"I do not doubt that the Soviet Union will manage to transform itself, and in the future the links that bind us will be primarily economic," said Mr. Gorbunov, adding he is reserving judgement for the moment as all talk of reforms "is just words."

Deputies Question Gorbunov on Moscow Visit

LD1506152690

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 1422 GMT on 13 June carries a 38-minute live question and answer session at the Latvian Supreme Soviet in Riga, in which Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Gorbunov answers deputies' questions on his recent visit to Moscow.

Deputy Lagzdins is the first to speak. He asks about the impropriety of attending the Federation Council session. He says: "Yesterday, when watching the television relay, I felt a kind of humiliation as if we had taken a step back and we have been put into a humiliating situation."

"So then, the question is: why go into a humiliating situation? Because we were invited to participate at a federation session, just like the leaders of other republics. The question is about that whether it would not have been useful to wait and to attend talks when Gorbachev would be willing (?to attend) with representatives of the three Baltic states."

Gorbunov replies: "Of course, a different course could have been taken, and one could wait for a convenient moment to take the course suggested by you. But, at least it seemed to us—not to me however, but I underline, it seemed to us—that we must, after all, make use of all opportunities, if we want to (?say) something [words indistinct]

"To our various objections, in discussions which took place, perhaps in various details, Gorbachev too, underlined more than once the following opinion: that if we want, after all, to begin something and to move forward, then we should with a certain piety, while perhaps also at some time retreating half a step, this dialogue should must, nevertheless, be restarted [words indistinct]. And Gorbachev understand very well that he is being criticized for this step, and it is natural that there will be critical objections, well, specifically addressed to me or to us."

Next, Deputy Silinskis asks for a more detailed explanation of what the freezing of the declaration's implementation means to Gorbunov or to Gorbachev, and whether during that period the adopted laws, for instance on alternative service, would not be valid.

Gorbunov says: "I think that Gorbachev was the first to use this expression. And remember, I informed you last time, I myself said that, as far as I know of—and I am connected with juridical practice—I do not understand this expression very well."

"Before travelling, taking into consideration that there could be all kinds of proposals and they would have to be assessed on the spot, I had consultations with our jurists, and perhaps the jurists would also expound in greater detail what 'freezing' means. As we understood, to a certain extent it is a half-judicial and half-political term, as it does not, after all, correspond to 'stopping'—if it were 'stopping', well, that term is clear to us—freezing, I think in fact, means not liquidating anything, but neither moving anything forward. It also means organizing talks, and during the talks to adhere to that kind of a status in relation to the declaration."

Deputy Steiks asks whether the speeches or addresses by Landsbergis and Ruutel also indicate that they too would propose to their parliaments to freeze the declaration under certain conditions.

Gorbunov replies: "This is a difficult question. In what respect? I would not like to comment upon either Mr. Ruutel or Mr. Landsbergis. Especially since Mr. Landsbergis, even at the press conference after our long meeting yesterday, was very evasive concerning any formulations and conclusions. I can only say that Mr. Ruutel, after we had jointly completed discussing our specific proposal, concurred with it. But he did not arrive with a specific proposal. But I think that they themselves should comment more exactly, because we have our parliaments, and how the questions will proceed and all the rest, we each must (?speak) in front of our parliaments."

Steiks then asks about Gorbunov's personal opinion why freezing should be considered.

Gorbunov replies: "You see, we could also do nothing until the situation was understood by everybody. If Gorbachev understands then it means that everybody understands. And if Gorbachev in a specific political action, in order to act further and to implement those proposals which we advance, he too advances such proposals, then, I think it is his affair, and we can react accordingly."

Deputy Kirsteins asks about the two parts of independence declaration, referring to the first part, to the illegalities which took place in 1940. He says: "And, in this connection, does Gorbachev know at all that in 1940 the elections were falsified, about all the ultimatums, that a referendum did not take place? And so my question is as follows: whether, then, by stopping or freezing this declaration the events of 1940 can be stopped? To freeze in some way? Is it not, after all, more correct to say that new laws could be left unadopted at present during the talks? At the same time, does the USSR Supreme Soviet cancel or recognize as illegal those decisions connected with admitting the Baltic states to the Soviet Union? Should it not be formulated in such a way, or are those matters not viewed at all like that? How shall we then freeze, let us say, the events of 1940? It is not clear to me."

Gorbunov says: "How freezing should take place was not discussed at all yesterday. A theory was advanced on a specific proposal that by means of a treaty we would determine the legal status of our transitional period. I did not discuss at all the manner of freezing, because I did not also have any authority to discuss it."

Next, Deputy Janis Krumins says: "Highly esteemed chairman, does it not appear to you that before such serious talks there should, after all, be parliamentary consultations, at least at the level of a consultation, with the rest of the deputies, in order that we would not be simply raisers of hands? The first question. And the second one: What appeared to you personally the most sympathetic in these talks, and what was most alarming to the republic of Latvia?"

Gorbunov replies: "You know, about the raisers of hands, well, such an idea does not occur to me by a long way. But also the idea that I should fulfill the role of a mailman is a long way away from me. Yes, this, too, is something if you ask the question that way."

"But, I think that, as much as I could, we had consultations, and therefore also there I underlined that this was not my personal standpoint, but that we had such views which have crystallized. And, as long as, at least to me it appears like that, as long as—in principle I already reported before that our principal task, the leadership's task, is to promote the legal status of the transitional period, because it fully conforms to the independence declaration, and as long as there are not some kind of specific trend, as long, it appears to me, in this tense situation, in order to have continual consultations with the parliament, I doubt whether this would be right, because in one or another way here we have so many consultations, in the first place, to discuss our specific submissions. After that, if it happens like that, then to discuss the delegation which will participate in the talks, and then these talks will take place to ratify this treaty, yes, so that I doubt whether this could be described only as a raising of hands."

"What is sympathetic? I already noted at the very beginning that the matter, but probably it is only a posture, I am not able to assert that it is so, but it appears that something has, after all, has changed. If only for the following reason: when Gorbachev summed up this talk he advanced such an idea that, evidently, our goal is a union of sovereign states. That was the first time that I have heard this from President Gorbachev."

"Second, he underlined the idea that in this union, to this union each republic will, evidently, go along its own road, that each republic will, evidently, have its own status. Because the processes at present in Tajikistan or elsewhere cannot be compared."

The next speaker, Indulis Berzins, wants a more exact definition on the proposal to freeze the declaration's implementation. He says: "So that it turns out that we are stopping further implementation of the declaration and are not touching all that what we have done for the

time being. Therefore, this is a question of principle. If you and Mr. Gorbachev also did not discuss this question, how did you receive, what do you think, because otherwise we are not simply capable of examining this question?"

Gorbunov replies: "I think that it is as it has been written there, and as I said."

Session Chairman Isvans proposes that now questions be put which would more specifically define what Gorbachev had offered, what had taken place at the talks, but the deputies would later have an opportunity of expressing their own opinions on Gorbachev's offer and on "our further action program concerning the Soviet leadership."

Deputy Budovskis is not clear about the freezing, as all parliamentary activity since 4 May has been in the name of the republic of Latvia. The Council of Ministers has been formed—would this freezing apply to it? He asks whether Gorbunov discussed the Ministry of Internal Affairs. On treaty relations between Russia and Latvia, he asked whether the parliament, with this freezing, could become a mere talking shop.

Gorbunov says that it seems to him that the word implementation expresses an activity which is connected not with the past, but with the future.

Deputy Bojars says: "Esteemed chairman: In your speech I did not see anything about the army, concerning (?its) status and all the rest. And I could not conclude anything from your speech either, because you were unclear on this question. Will it be touched upon, and if not, could you describe your attitude on what and how we should further decide, perhaps very briefly, the question of the army in principle?"

Gorbunov replies: "You see that this address is very brief, and that this address is as a proposal without a developed analysis. And I regarded it simply as a duty to translate it into Latvian and submit to you, so that there would be a complete clarity what I told you, even with all the commas."

"So then, I repeat that there was talk about the legal status of the transitional period in the form of a treaty. And I explained, when he said what it could look like, I said that at least two aspects. I repeated it all. I told you that."

"And as for specific issues, for example, today's contradictions which are connected with the army, then it is necessary to immediately resolve or to examine these contradictions by way of talks, and to conclude a relevant treaty concerning only the army. If some kind of other such problem would arise, then on the basis of the legal status of this transitional period it will be necessary also to examine the other problem and to conclude a relevant treaty. And not, on the one side, say that there

is one kind of laws, while others say that no, that there are entirely different laws and to threaten one with constitutions and so on."

Bojars says: "I directly asked you, what in brief are your opinions about the army, our future relations with the army and its status in the republic. Well, in two or three sentences, how shall we resolve this question?"

Gorbunov replies: "Esteemed colleague, we are now discussing the problem of the army, but I can of course reply. Well, I have already told you once. You critically expressed yourself, and, quite surely, you are right, but I understand that this is a very serious question which can be examined by way of talks and a relevant treaty can be concluded, thereby fixing the status of the army in Latvia and so on, its attitude towards the government of the republic of Latvia, subordination and coordination questions, and all the rest. But that is, it appears to me, specific talks which could end with a relevant treaty."

Session Chairman Ivans states that no talks have yet been held, there has been an offer to start talks, and this could be discussed today, and he invites further speakers.

Deputy Repse asks whether the obscurity concerning the freeze question does not indicate a rather vague ultimatum, and whether Estonia and Lithuania did not demand that the crude blockade be lifted.

Gorbunov replies: "Well, I would not like to comment, because here (simply) Mr. Landsbergis spoke. He also replied. But this question was of course one of the principal ones.

"You see why I do not want to answer. You are saying, was it an ultimatum or was it not an ultimatum, yes? Well, Mr. Landsbergis will, evidently, tell about that."

Repse goes on, "Yes, about this ultimatum, simply because of our economic situation we cannot interrupt the adoption of laws. So any kind of freeze is not serious."

Deputy Kostin, speaking in Russian, says: "Esteemed Anatoliy Valerianovich, I would like to hear your opinion as to what aim was defined yesterday or today—a confederation or a renewed federation? Proceeding from that how do you see, what is the status of the transitional period in Latvia?"

Gorbunov replies in Russian: "I can speak more exactly of a renewed federation. This term was not used at the Federation Council, or if it was used, then it was used in such a form that today it is not acceptable even purely psychologically in the effect of that term, because everything which was connected with the federation or the federation itself showed its bankruptcy. And whether we like it or not we must probably take consideration all the same of such a simple example: if indeed a crisis comes to a structure, and that crisis is admitted today by everyone, at least at the council and in the leadership of all republics and the leadership of the country, then to

propose that it must be renewed would probably purely from the psychological point of view be unacceptable. So it was not for nothing that Mikhail Sergeevich Gorbachev—I have already said this here—used another approach a union of sovereign states. Of course, if—as I have already said—if the majority of republics which were there had expressed themselves in favor of a confederative principles of the further development of the union, if we in our declaration had expressed ourselves in favour of independent development, then, of course, a confederative principle would prevail."

Deputy Yagupets, speaking in Russian, says: "Anatoliy Valerianovich, (did you) speak with the president of the USSR about the time interval of the transitional period, [words indistinct] your speech at the Federation Council you said that those with the least possibilities are the most interested in cooperation. I would like you to comment [words indistinct] who is more interested in constructive solution of the problems which have arisen between the republic of Latvia and the USSR. Thank you."

Gorbunov says in Russian: "The time factor was not stipulated because those were not negotiations. It was a proposal and an answer to a proposal, but in negotiation, naturally—I think—the time factor will also be stipulated. It is not unimportant. And the second question of yours was connected with specific utterances in my speech. Well, it seems to me that I spoke sufficiently clearly there."

Next, answering an indistinct question, Gorbunov says: "Well, I think that anyone who reads it will reflect his own way. I said here that nobody today has an interest on exclusivity. The possibilities, for example of Latvia, Russia, Kazakhstan, Belorussia, Ukraine—I said for example, namely not to list all but to list some various ones—but that does not exclude equal mutually advantageous relations in all areas. It is quite natural that whoever has the least possibilities is more interested in cooperation."

The next speaker is Deputy Geidans, with the question whether Gorbunov's reply that he did not know how the chairmen of Estonia and Lithuania had replied was not driving a wedge between the Baltic peoples.

Gorbunov says: "First of all, no kind of talks have been held or are being held in Moscow as yet. Preliminary work is being carried out in order for such talks to begin. And this preliminary work, purely by contacts at the level of proposals, is being carried out, well, by the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the Council of Ministers, as well by me and the deputies of the chairman of the Councils of Ministers. Therefore, it seems to me that it is our duty to carry out this preliminary work, to prepare, to give information to you, for you then to decide and assess, what to do further, whether to start talks or not to start talks. If to start talks, then to form a commission, and so on.

"But the first question, esteemed Mr. Geidans, is really delicate, because what I said I wrote for you, what I told Gorbachev I wrote down, in order that it would be exact, only in translation there could be some nuances here. What I was told, I am also telling you, and I am also ready to evaluate and to reply to your questions. But, really, Landsbergis and Ruutel, evidently, will themselves have their dialogues with the parliaments, and in a similar way."

The next speaker, Deputy Mogels, says: "Moscow has already promised us many things, and not only promised, but also laws have been adopted, for example on economic independence. But we know well how these promises and laws are to be carried out, don't we? And the essence of my question is as follows: let us assume that we—let us assume, I underline—do something with the declaration, either freeze it or postpone its implementation. What are the guarantees that in such an event Moscow would not suddenly refuse these talks? Perhaps it is only waiting to do this? And the second version, Moscow goes for talks, as it has been promised, yes? But our strategic aims are entirely opposite, are they not? We want to achieve state independence, but Moscow wants to preserve a united and indivisible union. Would it not be more proper, before going into talks, to come to an agreement for the aim of the talks, and to fix this in an official document? That we begin talks on concluding a treaty on the transitional period."

Gorbunov replies: "So then, Mr. Bojars would by all means answer more exactly. But in this situation one should not start talks on the aim of the talks, but to determine, first of all, the subject of the talks, because of an exact aim, those talks with an exact aim are rather difficult, at least in this situation."

"But, so then, we are now beginning to discuss what the consequences could be like. It was not my duty now to start such discussions about consequences, I informed what in practice we have offered and what kind of a reply we have received. I underline this once more."

"I think that world public opinion is, after all, disposed toward us starting talks. Only we think that talks cannot be started at all, and nothing can be talked about for 10 years at all. But, firstly, right away the subject of the talks should be determined. We have proposed a subject for the talks. So then, the subject of the talks is the legal status of the transitional period which must be realised by way of a treaty. That is how I understood it."

"What are the guarantees? Or a guarantee? I cannot give any guarantee? Because, if talks take place, and if at the talks both sides, two sides participate, then at any, at any moment one of the sides, motivating its action, can advance arguments for a discontinuation, including us, too, we could discontinue them, at any moment, if the proposed aims do not correspond to our aims."

Gorbunov goes on: "The agreement arrived at was such that—and it was expressed by President Gorbachev—if

there is a positive decision, then at least two days, he requested, are necessary in order for official talks to begin."

Deputy Repse asks, in connection with the center being unnecessary, about intensification of talks with the other republics, bypassing the centre, especially because the direct talks with the center are connected with a totally unacceptable political retreat from the declaration.

Gorbunov replies: "I think that in our arguments about the center we can express our arguments about the center diversely, about its necessary or unnecessary nature in the future and what that should center be like. But it appears to me that the legal status of the transitional period is no less important also to our political situation in our own republic. And if we do not want to take this into account, and if it is not necessary, then, evidently, perhaps a different approach will be adopted."

Deputy Zaletayev, speaking in Russian, says:

"Esteemed Anatoliy Valerianovich, can you stress once again what new aspects appeared as a result of your meeting with Gorbachev, because [words indistinct] Gorbachev proposes a freeze or suspension of the declaration then there will be negotiations. What new elements are there?"

Gorbunov replies in Russian, "In my view this is already the second time that we met [words indistinct]. I can say once again, firstly, the new thing was that we produced a specific proposal, not negotiations in general, but a theme for negotiations and in what form those negotiations should be concluded by means of concluding a treaty on the legal status of the transitional period. Then, secondly, what was new was that this proposal received a specific reply from the president."

Zaletayev then says: "Lastly, concerning your conversation with Boris Yeltsin. I would like to know whether you touched on his relations with the existing union structure. [words indistinct]"

Gorbunov replies "With Boris Yeltsin neither the army nor foreign relations were examined, but Yeltsin is very critical of the existing state structure in the form of state bodies, the central union ministries."

Deputy Vigotnis asks about Gorbunov's personal standpoint on whether freezing of the declaration would be connected with resuming the duty of young men serving in USSR armed forces.

Gorbunov says: "I request you once more to read this, this text, in which at the conclusion I said, in one word, the implementation of the declaration, and this, after all, is not in the past, but in the future. And here, of course, already questions were asked where the problems arise, what it will be like during this period of talks, but then we already are beginning to discuss this. If you ask me personally for this standpoint, I can express it."

"So then, if there is this problem, and I have already spoken about that, new problems could arise for us, which must be regulated, these must be regulated by means of treaties. But as regards the declaration and the adopted laws, then (?these) remain in force, but there is talk about a further implementation."

Session chairman Ivans says that questions are usually put for approximately half-an-hour, that he had received a proposal from Deputy Silars to discontinue questions, giving the deputies an opportunity to express their opinions on the talks with the USSR in a debate. It seemed also to him that all the possible questions had been asked.

The relay thereupon is concluded.

Gorbunov Appeals to Latvian Minorities

90UN2013D Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
12 May 90 p 1

["Appeal to the People of Latvia" from A. Gorbunov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Latvia]

[Text] On the land of Latvia live many national groups which, together with the indigenous nations—the Latvians and the ancient native people, the Livs—make up the people of Latvia. The cultural elements of all the national groups settling Latvia have always interwoven in harmony in the history and culture of Latvia. The whole people of Latvia together built an independent Latvian state in which the interests of the Latvian nation and of the national groups settling Latvia combined a common concern for a democratic state together with a desire to guarantee all citizens the conditions for free personal development, prosperity, participation in the administration of the state, and the right to free development of one's national culture.

In 1940 an abrupt change of life for all Latvia's citizens took place: They were united by a common road to Siberia which residents of Latvia of various nationalities had to travel along with Latvians, estrangement from property held for decades, and the terrors of Stalinism and the disasters of World War II.

A policy foreign to Latvia—national nihilism, artificially encouraged migration, compulsory assimilation, a decline in the economy as a result of socialist methods of management, depreciation of Latvian culture, and displacement of the culture of the national minorities—violated the natural equilibrium in Latvia of relations between nationalities. Similar processes also took place in the historical homelands of the national groups settling Latvia—in the republics of the Soviet Union and in the countries of East Europe.

Today we are all witnesses to the rebirth of the peoples of these countries. The states of East Europe, having democratically elected parliaments which express the will of the people, decide their fates themselves. This is an

objective process dictated by historical necessity which has encompassed all the East European peoples and is spreading inevitably in the Baltic region and the republics of the Soviet Union.

The republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet, recognizing that the restoration of an independent republic of Latvia is de facto the only way of guaranteeing the entire people of Latvia a life worthy of man, considers the most important principle of its activities to be the creation of guarantees of political freedoms and of economic and social rights for all national groups residing in Latvia and the provision of conditions for the development of their national culture while observing the general rights of man as well as the specific cultural interests of national minorities. The parliament of Latvia believes that it is its task to hold sacred the principles of democratic interrelations between nationalities which were characteristic of the republic of Latvia. The most dependable guarantee of this goal is the personal participation of representatives of the national groups of Latvia in the creation of the political, economic, and legal foundations of an independent Latvian state.

Only by being united will the people of Latvia be able to restore an independent, democratic, European, Latvian state in the common interest.

[Signed] A. Gorbunov, chairman of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet, in the name of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.
Riga, 4 May 1990.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium Members Listed

90UN2013C Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
12 May 90 p 1

["Decree of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet on the Formation of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet decrees:

To form a republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet Presidium consisting of the following personnel:

Gorbunov, Anatolijs Valeryanovich—chairman of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet, people's deputy from Marupskiy Electoral District No. 170.

Ivans, Dainis Evaldovich—first deputy chairman of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet, people's deputy from Smiltenskiy Electoral District No. 192.

Krastins, Andrejs Viktorovich—deputy chairman of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet, people's deputy from Strenchskiy Electoral District No. 193.

Daudiss, Imants Antonovich—secretary of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet, people's deputy from Saldusskiy Electoral District No. 177.

Batarevskiy, Oleg Valdimirovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Environmental Protection, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 7.

Blumbergs, Ojars Karlovich—chairman of the Working Commission on Architecture and Construction, Power Engineering, Transport, and Information Science, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 43.

Budovskis, Maris Pavlovich—chairman of the Standing Commission for Credentials and Deputies' Ethics, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 67.

Vulfsons, Mavriks Germanovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Foreign Affairs, people's deputy from Eleyskiy Electoral District No. 132.

Kekhris, Ojars Erikovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Economics, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 25.

Kozakevicha, Ita Yuryevna—chairman of the Standing Commission on Human Rights and Questions of Nationalities, people's deputy from Yekabpilsskiy Electoral District No. 129.

Kranstins, Ivars Valdisovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Social Security and Public Health, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 10.

Krumins, Girts Adolfovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Industry, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 5.

Lakis, Peteris Petrovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Public Education, Science, and Culture, people's deputy from Gulbenskiy Electoral District No. 124.

Salitis, Bronislaw Lyudvigovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Naval Matters, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 51.

Strikis, Voldemars Ernestovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Agriculture and Forestry, people's deputy from Ugalskiy Electoral District No. 201.

Cepanis, Alfreds Kazimirovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Trade and Services, people's deputy from Valkskiy Electoral District No. 191.

Skapars, Janis Janovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Government by the People and Social Matters, people's deputy from Limbazhskiy Electoral District No. 146.

Endzins, Aivars Arvidovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Legislative Matters, people's deputy from Rizhskiy Electoral District No. 66.

Yundzis, Talavs Edgarovich—chairman of the Standing Commission on Defense and Internal Matters, people's deputy from Lielvaldskiy Electoral District No. 158.

[Signed] A. Gorbunov, chairman of the republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.

I. Daudiss, Secretary of the Republic of Latvia Supreme Soviet.

Riga, 10 May 1990.

Latvian Interfront Appeals for Unity

90UN2013E Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
12 May 90 p 1

["Appeal to the People of Latvia" by the republic Inter-front council]

[Text] Fellow citizens! We live in complex times, times that require responsibility and political sense of each of us. The fate of the homeland, of our Soviet Latvia, is in our hands. How we live tomorrow depends on us and only on us now. Let us forget about fleeting rewards which only seem necessary, and instead turn our attention toward common sense, which was always a strong point of Latvia.

We are all citizens of one country and one republic. We all love it and wish it only one thing—prosperity for the good of the people. And this love is equally characteristic of the native Latvian, the native Latvian of any other nationality, and the worker who has recently arrived here. The main condition for this love and for responsibility for Latvia consists not in nationality but in the fact that a man who works on this land—grows wheat, builds homes, and heals people—cannot feel any other way about it.

And Latvia can be that much more indifferent to a person who has lived here all his life if he wishes to use its people or even sacrifice them for the sake of seizing political power or clinging to it for the sake of a soft spot, trips abroad, and special rations. Such people never cared much about the future of the Homeland. They betrayed it in the years of Stalinism and in the years of stagnation, and they are betraying it today as well.

It is not the question of a poor economy or the ecology which concerns the majority of the republic's Supreme Soviet now. It is not! It is all loud political protestations and no less generous promises—and nothing more.

But can we trust our chairman of the Supreme Soviet when over two years he has so abruptly changed his political views? Can we require much from his first deputy chairman with all his respect for young journalists? Is our prime minister, who is also a well-respected physics teacher, really able to understand economics? Will it be easy for him to set our neglected agriculture right?

And it is becoming increasingly hard to live. The very first acts adopted by the current Supreme Soviet without consulting the people, without a referendum, gave rise to panic and emptied shelves in the stores. Should not the example of Lithuania with its thousands of unemployed sober us? Is it really better to refuse the possibility of a

renewal of our life and strong, perpetual economic ties with a federation so that the old leadership can stay in power at any price? And do we all need freedom from the Soviet Union in favor of restrictive and inevitable dependence on the West? Perhaps it seems to some that all problems may be solved by giving priority to the indigenous nation. But there will never be peace in a society where inequality reigns. Well then, let us drive out the "immigrants"—the builders and factory workers, the teachers and doctors. And in their place let the previous emigrants from Latvia return in order to take over the factories, plants, and farms. And this is independence?

There is only one answer for all of us. National accord. Equal rights. And not just idle talk, but common labor for the good of the republic. The Soviet Union is a solid partner both in economics and in politics. All of these most vital question can only be resolved one way—democratically—through a national referendum.

Latvia Suspends Article of USSR Budget Law

LD2006100690 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga June 20 TASS—Latvia has become the most expensive place in the Soviet Union for smokers and alcohol drinkers, residents of the republic believe after the local parliament voted on Tuesday to increase prices of alcohol by 30 percent and tobacco by 100 percent. It is planned to use the money received to increase pensions and create scholarships.

The first attempt to increase the prices of these goods was made in December. But the proposal was not adopted by the former Supreme Soviet. Deputies said such a measure could be assessed as an attempt by the parliament and government to solve economic problems at the expense of the people. The new parliament has not even recalled the statement, although it considers itself democratic.

Estonia was the first to take such a measure, but the rise was smaller—the price of alcohol rose by 20 percent, tobacco—by fifty percent and beer—by 100 percent.

The Latvian Parliament adopted another decision that is expected to bring another 807 million roubles into the republic's treasury and eliminate the budget deficit of 156 million roubles. The parliament has suspended the functioning of Article 14 of the Union Law on the USSR State Budget for 1990 on Latvian territory.

The article determined that deductions from turnover and income taxes to Latvia's budget should amount to 57.5 percent. Deputies decided that income taxes of workers and office employees and 82.1 percent of turnover taxes will stay in the republic. Taxes on vehicle owners will not be deducted to the union budget either.

Some deputies believe the measure may cause a "war of prices" as some republics, especially in Central Asia, have long been accusing the Baltic Republics of using inexpensive cotton, coal, tobacco and other raw materials to produce expensive ready-made goods, turnover taxes on which are high.

More on Riga Conference Discussing Party Renewal

PM2006152990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent G. Kuchina dispatch under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Conference Held"]

[Text] Riga—At a scientific and practical conference held in the capital of Latvia, attention centered on topical questions of the democratization and renewal of the party. Taking part in the work of the conference were delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress from the Baltic republics as well as from the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and Kaliningrad Oblast, social scientists, gorkom and raykom [city and rayon party committee] secretaries, and the party aktivs from the aforesaid regions.

They analyzed the complex situation in the Baltic region, where, as was noted, social tension and the people's lack of confidence about the future are growing despite the apparent tranquillity. The leaders of movements which have come to power, it was said in the speeches, are displaying an inability to use this power in the true interests of the working people and with the aim of building a democratic society. They have forgotten their electoral promises to the effect that they would be concerned with the people's well-being, all efforts are merely aimed at political decisions, and the conditions have been formed for a "crusade" against the communists. The participants in the conference exchanged opinions on the party's tactics in the current phase.

The appeal to communists in the Soviet Baltic republics, adopted at the conference, calls on them to comprehend in all seriousness the complexity of the prevailing situation when the question of the existence of the Soviet socialist system in the region is at stake. The document also states that the "ranks of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU), the Estonian Communist Party (CPSU), and the Latvian Communist Party contain enough forces to carry out a decisive struggle for the defense of the socialist system in the Soviet Baltic Republics."

The secretaries of the Baltic Republics' Communist Party Central Committees held a session, which examined the decisions of the Baltic Council, held 6 June.

RSFSR

21 June Constituent Congress Session Previewed

LD2106065490 Moscow TASS in English 0621 GMT
21 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—The Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, which on Wednesday night proclaimed the creation of a Communist Party in the largest Soviet republic, will today discuss the election of a Central Committee and the new party's first leader.

Most speakers in the debate argued that the Russian Communist party should approach the Soviet party's 28th congress (which opens on July 2) with its own leader and Central Committee. Some speakers called for electing the leading bodies of the party after the Soviet party congress.

In addition, the congress is today expected to adopt a declaration determining principles on which the new party will act.

As far as the party's programme and rules are concerned, these will be elaborated and adopted during the second phase of the congress, which will be held after the Soviet party forum.

Party Congress Discusses Formation Principles

LD2106100290 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 21 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the first part of our bulletin, we will inform you about events of importance for the life of the whole country. We will be covering the sessions of Supreme Soviets and party congresses. Let us begin with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. [video report from RSFSR Communist Party Congress; long shot of platform, then closer one showing Gorbachev, Lukyanov chairing, and Ryzhkov at center of platform, followed by views of delegates at microphones and seated]

The Constituent Congress of the RSFSR Communist Party, which proclaimed the formation of the Russian Communist Party, today embarked on discussing the text of a resolution on the organizational principles for the formation of the party. As a result of examining amendments to the text in the drafting commission, congress delegates came to a decision that the RSFSR Communist Party unites the party organizations of the CPSU located on the republic's territory, and is a component part of the CPSU. It is guided by the latter's program documents and rules, and shares a single party card with it.

The constituent congress is to elect the first secretary, the Central Committee, and the control commission of the republic's Communist Party. It has been recognized as necessary to form a politburo of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee. The newly elected party Central Committee is being instructed to prepare proposals for the agenda and dates for the second stage of the constituent congress. The forum of Russia's communists is continuing its work.

Spokesman on 'Rumors' of Gorbachev Resignation

LD2006185390 Moscow TASS in English 1834 GMT
20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Rumours about the possible or supposed withdrawal of President Mikhail Gorbachev from the post of the Soviet Communist Party general secretary were discussed by the Russian Federation Communist Party's congress press centre spokesman Aleksandr Lebedev at a briefing here today.

Rumours were prompted by a remark made by Gorbachev at the congress during the discussion concerning a delegation from Russian communists to the First Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies.

Lebedev cited Gorbachev's exact words and noted that they "seemed to give no special ground for discussing the prospect for the withdrawal."

Lebedev told journalists that the congress secretariat decided to ban journalists from the session on Thursday as it will elect the leading bodies of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation created today.

Journalists were invited to meet Leningrad delegation members led by First Secretary of the Regional Party Committee Boris Gidasov at the congress press centre on Thursday.

Lebedev summed up major speeches made at the congress today.

Gorbachev Urged To Remain Party Secretary

AU2006124890 Paris AFP in English 1204 GMT
20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 20 (AFP)—This is not the time for Mikhail Gorbachev to relinquish his joint leadership of the country and Communist Party, Moscow party boss Yuriy Prokofyev said here Wednesday. Mr. Gorbachev had earlier Wednesday told a conference of Russian communists here that he might shortly quit his job of party general secretary.

"For the time being, this isn't the right time because the new organs of state power are only just starting to be put into place," the official told a press conference.

"In the present situation, if there were two powers, it could have the most negative consequences," Mr. Prokofyev said.

"In future, when the new political structure is truly in place, holding such offices concurrently will neither be compulsory, nor necessary," he added.

20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists

Conference Renamed

LD2006183290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 20 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the 20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists in Moscow. Chairman Lukyanov asks delegates to register.

At 1704 GMT it is announced that 2,619 delegates are present. The quorum figure is 1,298, so work can begin.

At 1705 GMT after announcements of birthdays, Lukyanov calls on Khodyrev, chairman of the Credential Commission, to address the delegates. He confirms that the present conference has full powers to make appropriate decisions in current circumstances. Gorbachev is seen to be present in the Presidium. Khodyrev says most delegates at various meetings around the country have voiced support for the formation of a Russian Communist Party. Representatives from fraternal communist parties in other republics are present. The election of the delegates present was fully democratic, Khodyrev says, and on a contested basis. Everything has been done in proper fashion. Video shows Medvedev and Zaykov present in the audience. He describes voting rights at the conference and the occupational composition of the delegates. Video shows Razumovskiy in audience near Medvedev.

At 1722 GMT Lukyanov says that he has received a lot of notes calling for the redesignation of the conference as the inaugural conference of the Russian Communist Party. This decision, he says, can only be made by delegates collectively. He then reads out a draft decision to this effect. He calls for a vote, but Yegorov comes to a microphone and says that Validzhanov should be allowed to speak on behalf of the council of secretaries of primary party organizations. Lukyanov persists in his drive to secure a vote. He calls for a vote on whether to vote on the decision. He says there is a majority in favor of voting. He rereads the draft decision and then asks whether a named vote should take place. He puts the issue to the vote. Result: for 1,983; against 479; abstained 36. Video shows Ryzhkov present in the Presidium. A vote is then taken on the redesignation of the conference along the lines of the draft decision. Result: for 2,316; against 171; abstained 38. The decision redesignating the conference is passed. There is applause.

At 1734 GMT Lukyanov announces that the conference is now the Constituent Congress of the Russian Communist Party.

At 1736 GMT Lukyanov turns to the issue of the status of the workers and peasants who have been invited to the congress. Should they be allowed to vote? Rybakov from Kemerovo says that they should be allowed to vote. A delegate from Irkutsk says that, in general, the working

class should be given a greater opportunity to speak at the congress. A worker from Tambov comes to the rostrum and calls for a named vote so that the electorate can see who is against the workers. A delegate from Krasnoyarsk says that it would be a violation of procedure if invited workers are to be given the same rights as elected delegates. Other delegates state their views for and against.

At 1744 GMT a woman delegate comes to the rostrum, seeking to speak on a procedural matter. Lukyanov refuses. Another woman speaks on the issue. Video shows Yazov present in the audience. Despite objections, Lukyanov puts the first proposal to a vote—whether to confer consultative voting rights on the invited guests. Result: for 2,825; against 228; abstained 26. Voting rights are granted to the visitors. Lukyanov declares a 30-minute break.

Party Formation Viewed

LD2006200190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1748 GMT on 20 June continues to carry its recorded relay of the 20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists in Moscow.

The afternoon sitting begins after a 30-minute interval. Lukyanov says that many delegates had complained about the time spent on procedural matters. He proposes that the exchange of credentials should be discussed.

At 1751 GMT a female delegate from Kirov complains that the standing orders are not being adhered to. She says that there must be a Russian Communist Party. The new party must be a free and benevolent organization, in which people feel at home. It must protect their interests. Democratic centralism must remain. Video shows Abalkin present in the audience. The delegate says rural party organizations must be assisted. There are some communists in Kirov who want to leave the party. She points out shortcomings in the party's ideological work. More attention should be paid to working with young people, their education, youth organizations and the Komsomol (All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League). She makes some proposals about deputies' status, material assistance to the party and calls for common sense and not emotions to hold sway at the conference.

At 1804 GMT Lukyanov reads out list of deputies who have put their names down to speak.

At 1805 GMT Prokofyev, first secretary of the Yakut Obkom (oblast committee), says that the communists of his region voted unanimously for the formation of a Russian Communist Party. He criticizes the party's failure to solve many socioeconomic tasks and puts a lot of the blame on local party bodies. Too many party secretaries seem to stand around and wait for the general secretary to decide things for them. He lists various proposals on a future structure of the party apparatus

and its social base. Autonomous oblasts should be given the status of sovereign republics and their economic independence should be based on republican state ownership.

At 1815 GMT Deputy (Mashatin) from Bashkiria says that the views of the Democratic and Marxist platforms should not be ignored. He questions how ready the country is for a transition to a market economy. He talks at some length about the industrial development of Bashkiria. He takes issue with those who are talking about leaving the party but calls for more equality and fewer privileges among party ranks. He points to the importance of the media and calls for the party to publish its own periodicals. He quotes from Maksim Gorkiy about the party's ties with the people.

At 1827 GMT Deputy Validzhanov, party committee secretary of the Kama heavy truck plant, talks about the creation of a council of secretaries of RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) primary party organizations and its functions. He calls for an organizing committee to be set up for the election of leading party officials in the republic. In order that the newly-formed party does not commit the mistakes of the old, attention must be focused on its social base.

At 1831 GMT Deputy (Akimibova) from the Altay laments the delay in adopting decisions. The CPSU rules should be the basis of the whole country but each republic should be able to make its own decisions. She hits out at pornography, sex and crime—and says that sort of glasnost is not needed.

At 1837 GMT Polozkov of Krasnodar Kray takes the rostrum and says that many of today's problems result not just from Stalin's deformations, but also from the mistakes of perestroika. The good things of the past must be protected. The present party leadership has made mistakes, he says. The Politburo has been criticized, but nothing has changed. "Organized demolition of the CPSU from the inside" is what is happening at the moment. Communists favor perestroika, but not at the price of falling living standards. Foreign models of socialism cannot be adopted wholesale. The people must be consulted over such issues as private ownership of land and the means of production. There is no crisis for the CPSU—just for its leading bodies. Polozkov says communists should not feel that they are to blame for everything that has been done in their name, but without their knowledge. The party must be democratized in accordance with Lenin's original blueprint. Society, too, must be democratized. The creative efforts of the people must not be rejected. He concludes by saying the congress must elect all the leading bodies of the new party.

Farming Policy Blamed

LD2006212290

[Editorial Report] Moscow television Service in Russian at 1848 GMT on 20 June continues to carry its recorded relay of the 20 June Constituent Congress of Russian

Communists in Moscow. The chairman of the Kurgan people's control committee says that people want to see a strong, united party—a party that is part of the CPSU. Most Russians want an independent Communist Party, but one that is within the framework of the CPSU. The present Central Committee is feeble, and the people will show their displeasure at the CPSU Congress, he says.

The Kurgan chairman continues that farmworkers are currently blamed for the food problem. It is said that they do not work—the truth is that they have very little technical and logistical backup. Who is actually running Soviet agriculture? The Central Committee's farming policy is in ruins. Farms are in a perilous economic plight. They must be defended by the future Central Committee of the RSFSR party. Central Committee members must not be remote figures in the background, he says. They must see the farms for themselves. Why have there been so many personnel changes among first secretaries in recent years? Communist Party members must adhere to communist ideas. The creativity of the masses must be cherished and encouraged by the party leadership. He adds that people like Melnikov and Tyulkin are needed in the Central Committee. The status of primary party organizations must be enhanced.

At 1900 GMT video shows Ligachev present in the audience. Delegate Petrovich from Magadan talks about the nature of the party. Now is the time for it to regain the trust of the people. He says the party must champion the cause of collective ownership, but it must permit other forms of ownership as well. New forms of cooperation with trade unions is required. Ordinary workers have lost trust in party leaders and are leaving the party. He asks why there is a delay over monetary reform? Where is the struggle against the mafia? He notes that food stocks are low in Magadan. The Far North provides much of the USSR's foreign currency, yet it seems to have low priority when it is a matter of doling out basic foods and goods. He asks why the party leadership is indifferent to the working class attitude towards it? Why does it ignore the Donetsk miners and the Action Council in Leningrad? People who are deceived become enemies, he says.

At 1913 GMT Delegate (Zhitinev) describes the bureaucracy that has to be overcome in order to speak at the congress. Video shows a large group of military delegates. He goes on to describe the work of the secretariat and the congress' information facilities.

At 1921 GMT Delegate Oskolskiy from Leningrad asks when the sociological review will be available. Zhitinev says: As soon as possible. Another delegate asks whether there will be a verbatim record of the congress. A delegate says that the verbatim record is published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

At 1924 GMT Lukyanov reads out a greeting telegram from the Ukrainian Communist Party and says that the Russian Communist Party must send a suitable reply. The Amur party organization proposes that priority

should be given to workers and peasants when selecting speakers. Lukyanov says that half of today's speakers are workers and peasants.

At 1927 GMT Delegate Alekseyev from Tataria asks who is in the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee. Delegate Chepak asks for time in which to consult colleagues. He asks that priority be given to visitors when selecting speakers. Another delegate complains about the small number of microphones in the hall.

At 1930 GMT Lukyanov makes a few announcements, mainly about meetings to take place during the main break.

At 1932 GMT a member of the credentials commission clarifies the situation regarding the exchange of credentials following the redesignation of the conference.

At 1933 GMT Lukyanov declares a break.

Ligachev Speaks

LD2006222590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1934 GMT on 20 June continues to carry its recorded relay of the 20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists in Moscow. The evening session begins. Chairman Lukyanov lists those who wish to speak in the session.

At 1938 GMT Gorbachev corrects the chairman on a point of procedure over the order of debate.

At 1939 GMT Delegate (Shenin) says that the formation of the Russian party was inevitable in the light of the economic shortcomings which have built up over the last few years. It must be a party of discipline and unity and win the prestige of the people through practical deeds. He says it should have a politburo and standing committees and primary party committees. It must be a reliable buttress of the CPSU and its Central Committee. There should be criticism of the general secretary but not abuse. The role of our congress should be one of unification because the destiny of the people is dear to us, he says.

At 1947 GMT the first secretary of the Chechen-Ingush Obkom says that over the years the party has been the unifying force of the people. As a regional leader he is most concerned about interethnic relations and certain ironic remarks about the "unified Soviet people." He is opposed to the separation of the party into national elements. The lack of a realistic regional policy has led to the developments we have seen in the Baltic region, for example. The idea of a RSFSR party has been developing over the years, he says. The government's economic program has led to nationwide discussion but the Central Committee has kept silent about it. The party must win the respect of the people and be able to influence it.

At 1959 GMT Boyko, member of the Military Council of the Air Defense Forces, says there is no way the Army can be separated from the party and the people. His delegation supports the platform of the CPSU as a party of a vanguard type. We need a party where every member can have his say and appointments should depend on a person's professional qualities, he says. The members of the Armed Forces are most concerned about the "anti-Army syndrome" in the country. He says that if we expose blank spots from our past we should also be prepared to expose those of the perestroika period, too. The Army is going through difficult times and needs the support of the people. The Armed Forces are facing many problems connected with the withdrawal of our troops from Eastern Europe and Mongolia. He calls for a sensible approach to reductions in defense spending and says there should be no reduction in the membership of communists in the Armed Forces.

At 2020 GMT Murashkin, a delegate from Moscow region, says that no delegate from Moscow has been asked to speak so far. The chairman says this is a matter for the Secretariat.

At 2012 GMT (Grudin), a delegate from Krasnoyarsk, says that if we want to get by without mistakes we should have elected Solomon and not the general secretary.

At 2014 GMT Delegate Yefremenko says that the working people are not concerned at what is going on in this 'talking shop' but whether the factories are going to be sold with their workers and the land with the peasants. He hits out at those people who expect privileges; he is not against them in principle but says care must be taken as to who merits them.

At 2023 GMT Ligachev takes the rostrum. He believes that a separate Russian Communist Party will strengthen the unity of the CPSU. There is no alternative to perestroika. The first years were difficult but what we have achieved has been much. Why has this taken place, Ligachev asks. There has to be a self critical analysis of the activity of the political leadership. I form part of that leadership and accept my responsibility, he says. The party's strategy is aimed at the renewal of society: this shows far-sightedness on the part of the leadership. But serious mistakes have been made in strategy and tactics. Ligachev says I myself did not see the main dangers. It's become the custom to divide opponents into right and left, radicals and conservatives. Ligachev proposes a different approach. It's a question of revisionism. He refers to a letter sent to the Central Committee containing an ultimatum that communism as a goal should be rejected. This fully reflected the stance of the Democratic Platform and even went further. What they are talking about is a party that is different in principle. I understand that compromises are necessary, but they must be only upon a correct ideological basis. Let me stress that we have to win people over to our party's platform.

At 2030 GMT Ligachev says political work in the Politburo has slacked off: lately there has been no discussion there of the economic measures, nor of the situation in East Europe. Many proposals have been made that these should be discussed, but there has been no Central Committee plenum on them. Can one really call this state of affairs democratic? The voice of the party member should be heard everywhere. Ligachev goes on to talk about the need to strengthen party influence among the workers and peasants. He calls for party bodies to support the peasant union which has just been formed. Politically active fighters should be chosen from among the peasants, he says.

At 2035 GMT Ligachev continues that the Russian countryside is indeed in a deplorable state. Fewer and fewer resources are going into agriculture. There is endless talk, but the situation does not get any better. Collective and state farms have to be restructured, technical facilities, and more capital investment have to be provided.

We have always dealt as a party with social policy, says Ligachev. The authority of the party among the masses depends on this. We are faced with many difficulties. I believe that we will succeed. There is applause.

Deputies Demand Agenda

LD2676230790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2038 GMT on 20 June continues to carry its recorded relay of the 20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists in Moscow.

Zhilin, a collective farm chairman takes the floor. He says that 23 people have spoken. We must continue the discussion but let's not repeat ourselves and let's restrict our contributions to five minutes and let's make specific proposals. Zhilin is thanked for his words.

At 2042 GMT Delegate Cheptinov takes the floor: We have gathered to report to the congress how the country's communists view the situation in the party; we are worried by the lack of clarity and the half measures in what the Politburo and Central Committee are doing. Faith in the vanguard role of the party is disappearing he says. First and foremost there must be consolidation of the party ranks; the party must become a dynamic frontranking force in society.

At 2044 GMT Karpov from Kemerovo interrupts to complain about time-wasting and repetition. He says: If someone has something new in principle to say, let him say it. (applause)

Cheptinov continues and asks for his point of view to be heard. He speaks about the need to reduce the number of people in the party apparatus to a reasonable minimum. There are too many departments in the Central Committee that are isolated from each other. He speaks about the intellectual strengths of the academies under the Central Committee which are not yet providing a proper

return; the question of party ethics and morals is highly important at this critical time. He speaks of interethnic relations as a major problem; we have to become a free alliance of peoples with equal rights; we have to look facts in the face.

At 2050 GMT the chairman says he has received a request to address the congress by one of the invited workers. Worker Ryazanov takes the floor. He talks about the shortage of goods in the stores. He says the question of income tax still hasn't been decided: People need to know what the figures are going to be. He speaks about the need for sound education, about training with computer equipment. He speaks about the growing crime rate amongst young people; we talk a lot about defending the workers, but how can we defend them; only the law can do so, and that only when it is carried out and implemented; let me ask on behalf of the 200 invited workers that we have a meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the people will understand if they are consulted.

At 2055 GMT Delegate Kalinin proposes a temporary interval in the debate: after the interval contributions should be limited to seven minutes. There are other organizational proposals.

At 2056 GMT Delegate Stolyarov, of the Air Force, says that we agree we must have a Russian Communist Party, but it must have leaders. That's the main issue—let's discuss it now.

A Chelyabinsk delegate complains about procedural issues; we must support the proposal of the Air Force delegate: cut short the debate and vote.

At 2057 GMT another delegate proposes that the debate should end and that an agenda should be adopted with elections on it.

At 2058 GMT a Bryansk delegate says that the discussion is not really about the topic on the agenda; the main object of the congress is to set up the party and vote on the leadership. He speaks of the need for an agenda and mentions some of the topics he feels should be on it and under discussion; too much attention is paid to the problems of individual regions, too much time is spent sticking labels on people.

At 2100 GMT Zaytsev from Murmansk says: let's continue the debate today and tomorrow, but cutting down the duration of each contribution.

At 2101 GMT Ovchinnikov from Leningrad says: let's discuss the name of the party.

The chairman says: shall we suspend the debate now and deal with other issues? After the interval he says we'll deal with the other issues and announces a 30-minute interval.

At 2103 GMT the cameras show the second part of the evening sitting of the congress. The leadership is seen taking its seats on the platform, delegates taking papers, and notes to the platform.

At 2105 GMT Lukyanov, in the chair, announces that the congress continues its work. He says that a number of comrades on the list of speakers insist that the debate be considered, that then the decision on the party should be adopted; thereafter miscellaneous business; today let's complete the debate and adopt the decision; are there objections?

At 2107 GMT a delegate objects because he has no agenda. Lukyanov repeats his proposals.

At 2108 GMT Delegate Boltovskiy complains about the way Lukyanov and Usmanov have conducted the proceedings: let's stick to the standing orders. Lukyanov says he has stuck to the standing orders, everyone has seen what has happened, we have taken proper decisions in a calm atmosphere. He gives the names of those who are invited to take the floor. There are six of them. They insist on speaking.

More on Party Formation

LD2006231490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2111 GMT on 20 June continues to carry its recorded relay of the 20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists in Moscow.

The speaker, an engine driver, talks about the fact that rank-and-file members of the party do not know the members of the Central Committee: We need specific measures to avoid repeating past mistakes; the rank-and-file are not in need of sympathy they deserve the place and the representation they seek. He speaks about the specific problems of Siberia: The only way out of the difficulties is to make the communist the genuine master of the party.

At 2116 GMT Grishchuk, a Voronezh factory director, takes the floor: The drama in the current situation lies in the fact that this time the country cannot leave things over to the next generation; we have to decide; we were right to decide that we need a party; we have heard a range of opinions. He speaks of pluralism in the views expressed, which is to the benefit of the party; the vanguard role of the party cannot be declared, it has to be earned. He talks about the need to seek the golden mean. He talks about deideologization; the ideology of the CPSU must not enjoy any privileges. He talks about adding the word humanistic to the phrase democratic centralism.

Grishchuk goes on to the matter of the forthcoming elections to the party's Central Committee; we need new people with new ideas. He says that the current congress is more demanding than any previous one: we say that

never before has the Central Committee been so ineffective—do we really mean that when we think of the Central Committee under Chernenko?

At 2126 GMT Aleksandr Nikiforov takes the floor. He says that the Volgograd delegation supports the idea of a Russian party which should be called the Communist Party of the RSFSR. He proposes a rotating Central Committee. He speaks about the need for sound documents to be adopted at the forthcoming 28th party congress: We are still a long way away from mastering the art of working under parliamentary and multiparty conditions; let's have congresses or conferences every year at which the results of the year's work can be added up. This would make the CPSU a working party of the Leninist type. He criticizes the way political games are being played at soviet sessions at all levels.

At 2132 GMT Delegate Bystrov from Moscow says that many people are pinning great hopes on the RCP (Russian Communist Party). We must avoid making mistakes at this point. What must be done in between forming the party and electing its officers? One thing is that we must defend the rights of national formations within the structure of the RCP; the new party must provide an example to the CPSU; concrete programs must be worked out.

At 2138 GMT Delegate Kovalev from Novosibirsk wonders at the chaos that now besets party and country in the fifth year of perestroika. Where are the party ideologists, who are now so notoriously absent, at a time when there are so many anticommunist critics? Shortcomings are visible to everyone; ordinary people are concerned to see the dissension that is now evident in the highest echelons of the party; more modesty would also benefit party officials.

At 2147 GMT Delegate Shikin criticizes recent excesses such as the demonstration against politburo leaders on May Day; the party today is beset by internal "liquidators"; the RCP is being founded in order to tackle the existing tasks and build a solid future. He goes on to talk about the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, tracing its history and urging that it should be regarded as the organ of the new party. He reminds the audience that Lenin approved of the name "Russian Communist Party."

Party Name Discussed

LD2006233990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2155 GMT on 20 June continues to carry the recorded relay of the 20 June Constituent Congress of Russian Communists in Moscow.

Delegate Sotnikov from Khabarovsk complains of the present situation in which comradely criticism is replaced by a more vitriolic variety and outsiders are also highly and unpleasantly critical of the party. He

complains of recently seen placards; the new rules must spell out the rights of primary party organizations.

At 2158 GMT Lukyanov says that three more people wish to speak.

At 2202 GMT Delegate Kobyzhev from Sverdlovsk proposes that the forthcoming party congress should be regarded as an emergency one in view of the general crisis atmosphere. He wonders why Gorbachev has found no time to consult local officials over the proposed transition to a market economy.

At 2211 GMT Delegate Maltsev, a philosopher by background, says that Marxism needs to be developed in line with the times; the point at issue is not the reforms themselves, but the direction they are taking; a bourgeois trend has already begun, and we need to set limits to this in our endeavors to achieve democratic socialism.

At 2217 GMT Delegate Terentyev says that the clash of views in party decisionmaking should take into account alternative proposals and the names of those who put them forward must be made known; if we abandon the word "communism" we shall be seen as renegades; let it be called the Russian Communist Party.

At 2223 GMT Delegate Smirnov says reform has provided a chance for renewal, but there may not be another opportunity. A stable political situation can only be created by a stable economy.

At 2227 GMT Lukyanov says that a draft decision on the establishment of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation is available to delegates; there are also proposals to call it the Communist Party of the Russian Federation or the Russian CP.

At 2230 GMT Delegate Bendyakov says he wants it to be called the CP of the Russian Federation.

At 2231 GMT another delegate says call it the CP of the RSFSR.

At 2232 GMT another delegate says the proposed name is too long and it should be the Russian Communist Party.

Delegates propose "All-Russian Communist Party," "Russian Republican Organization of the CPSU," and "Communist Party of the RSFSR".

At 2237 GMT Lukyanov proposes a vote on "Communist Party of the RSFSR." Passed: 1,414 for; 1,049 against; 56 abstentions.

At 2240 GMT there is an objection from the floor that there should have been a two-thirds majority. Lukyanov says that two-thirds was only needed for turning the conference into the founding congress. Gorbachev briefly intervenes to back Lukyanov. Lukyanov reads some of the draft decision.

At 2243 GMT a deputy suggests a vote on whether to elect the party's officials at the second stage of the congress. Delegates make further proposals about the proposed decision.

At 2253 GMT Lukyanov tries to end the debate, but there are queues of delegates wishing to speak. Lukyanov says there could be another vote separating the creation of the new party from its name. Gorbachev briefly speaks to back this. A vote is taken on the establishment of the party. Carried: 2,507 for; 50 against; six abstentions. Lukyanov calls this a "huge" majority.

At 2302 GMT Lukyanov asks for a vote on the wording of the point of the decision saying the new party is an "inalienable part" of the CPSU. Carried: 2,140 for; 348 against; 53 abstentions.

At 2306 GMT Lukyanov reads the draft of a telegram of greetings from the RSFSR party congress to the Ukrainian CP congress. Applause from delegates. A hand vote is taken and Lukyanov says that the text, as far as he sees it, has been approved unanimously.

At 2311 GMT a Leningrad delegate complains that some people in the hall from Leningrad are not entitled to take part in the conference. Some applause from the floor.

At 2315 GMT a delegate from the Chuvash ASSR (Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic) complains that the proceedings of the conference are being published in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA but through a shortage of newsprint SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA is not being published at present in the Chuvash and Mari ASSRs.

At 2316 GMT Lukyanov closes the sitting and adjourns the work of the congress until 0600 GMT tomorrow.

Ligachev Addresses 20 June Constituent Congress

*LD2106001990 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2023 GMT 20 Jun 90*

[Speech by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at Constituent Congress of Russian Communists in Moscow on 20 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrades, like many of you I back the formation of an RSFSR Communist Party within the CPSU, and also the election at our congress of its ruling bodies and the setting up of printed publications. Why do I back this? It's because I believe in the strong internationalist traditions of the communists of Russia and of all its peoples. I believe that the Communist Party of Russia, like the whole of Soviet Russia, will strengthen the unity of the CPSU and the integrity of the Soviet Federation and will genuinely become a catalyst for the processes of renewal. That is the first thing I wanted to say.

Second, whatever problems we happen to discuss—and there really is a multitude of them today—one literally cannot get the two main ones out of one's head: what is

to happen to the country and the Soviet Federation, and what is to happen to the party. No, there is no alternative to restructuring. We cannot go on living as we did up to 1985. We all embarked on restructuring with enthusiasm. In the early years, things were on the up and up. Both gains and failures are evident. The social reorientation of the economy, democratization of the soviets, changes in the party, and the elimination of the threat of nuclear war—I think you will agree that each of these taken individually has been an enormous advance.

But at the same time the political situation in society remains extremely difficult, and the most alarming thing is that it is tending to get even worse. The country is in disarray. The economy is moving backward and the living costs are on the increase. National separatism is spreading. The Soviet Federation is being dismembered. People are dying. The question on literally everyone's lips is: what sort of a state is it that is incapable of defending its citizens?

In reply, one can frequently hear appeals to the effect that one should not panic. Of course panic does not help, but I think we must resolutely get rid of the sentiment that everything will come out all right in the end, and that things could be worse. The question that arises is, why did all this happen. Are these inevitable concomitants of the policy of restructuring, or the consequences of the mistakes and errors of the present leadership? Today, as was mentioned here, it really isn't a question of repentance, but of honest and open analysis and a self-critical assessment of the activity of the political leadership, of which I am a member, and bear—I would like to say this in all honesty, too—my full measure of responsibility. And I consider the demand of delegates that members of the politburo should give an account of themselves at the party congress to be quite proper, and I shall make such a report myself at the 28th congress. [applause]

I'd now like to say this. The party's strategy, geared to the renewal of society, and its principal delegations, are correct. And I think that the boldness and farsightedness of the leadership were manifested in this. And I want to say honestly here—despite it being a generally known fact—that the political initiative here belongs to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

But serious omissions and grave mistakes indeed were made in the tactics, methods, and approaches to reform. I believe that, as a politburo member, I did not realize fully and with due principledness the main danger for the policy of perestroika, namely the systematic and ever increasing work of antisocialist forces aimed at weakening and, eventually, destroying from within—I would like to stress from within—the Communist Party and, consequently, the socialist union of the republics. It is customary now to divide the opposition forces into leftwingers and rightwingers, radicals and conservatives. Frankly speaking, I have a different approach. I think one should put it as follows: the majority of communists in the party adhere to Marxist-Leninist positions and

platforms of scientific socialism. At the same time, social democratic, revisionist movement, centrists, and national-separatists are in evidence in the party.

There are quite a few of those who are nostalgic for Stalin's times. Many advocate private ownership, market-based environment, and factions in the party, and reject the principle of democratic centralism. What is all this, comrades? Is it radicalism? No, it is pure revisionism, there is not a grain of anything new, we have seen it all before. On the eve of the party congress—let me tell you this—ideologists from the Democratic Platform sent a special message to the party Central Committee; generally speaking, it would not be bad to familiarize the delegates to the congress with it. In the message they, in the form of a ultimatum—in the form of a ultimatum, I stress—with the following conditions demanded that the progressive part of the politburo, not to mention the conservative part, as they put it, adopt the positions of the Democratic Platform, namely, give up communism as the CPSU's goal, recognize different ideologies in the party, and give up the principle of democratic centralism. In other words, the things that were named here, although in a different form, by the speaker from the Democratic Platform.

But it should be mentioned that he did not name yet another categorical demand, which is to replace in full the party leadership in the center and in the provinces—by at least 90 percent, as was written in parentheses. One could ask: are any compromises possible, given such a position? The views of the leaders of the coordinating committee of the Democratic Platform leave no doubt as to the fact that it is a question, comrades, of a fundamentally different party. We cannot indulge in the impossible daydreams of Agafya Tikhonovna, the famous character in Gogol's play "The Marriage." As you remember, in describing her bridegroom, she dreamed of combining incompatible qualities in a single individual.

I understand very well that compromises are essential in politics. But they should be only on a healthy and principled basis. Therefore, as it seems to me, the renewal of the party means not only the democratization of internal party life but also organizational and ideological delineation. Otherwise, it is not possible to consolidate the progressive forces, to maintain the party in fighting shape. But at the same time I would like to stress that all this was understood despite of the stance taken by the supporters of the Democratic Platform. We must constantly step up the work with its supporters in the localities, convince them of the correctness of our views, and win them over to the side of our party platform.

But, comrades, I would like to talk about something else. We often, not without deep satisfaction, have said that collectiveness, democratism, and taking others' opinion into account are inherent characteristics of the present political leadership of the country. Of late, in the work of the politburo these features have begun to be lost. One example: The government measures for changing over to

a regulated market economy—and this you must agree is some policy—were not discussed—and I would like to say this—either in the politburo or at a plenum of the party Central Committee. Thus, the political leadership was left out.

Here is another serious example. Up to now no analysis has been made at Central Committee level of the events in Eastern Europe. The German question has not been examined. And this is also major politics. For the socialist community has disintegrated and the positions of imperialism have grown incredibly stronger. The question inevitably arises: did I raise these problems in the politburo? Yes I did, and more than once. I wrote memos to the politburo giving grounds for the discussion of the question of the current moment, the market economy, and the integrity of the state at a plenum of the Central Committee.

My proposals are not what is at issue. Many such proposals were made, by the Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Novosibirsk, and other party organizations of Russia. But no plenum was held on these important questions. I would like to ask: is this democratic? The collective nature of the leadership is a very important principle of party building which proceeds from Vladimir Ilich Lenin. In the past the party has paid a heavy price when it retreated from it. We cannot allow a repetition. One cannot lead the party, this leading force, without giving it all one's time—or perhaps it is possible to do without it.

Speaking about the collective nature of the leadership, I would like to expand the framework of this concept. It is important to put every communist in the center of party life so that his voice and the opinion of the primary party organization should not only be heard at all levels of the party, including in the Central Committee, but what is important is not only to hear it, what is important is for it to be heeded.

Continuing the discussion of the party and strengthening it, I cannot avoid speaking about intensifying party-political influence among the working class and the peasantry. This is, by the way, at the wish of the future Central Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party. Now, as has already been said here at length, workers and peasants are rather poorly represented in state and party bodies. I, for example, would call this democracy nothing other than curtailed democracy.

Extremist groups are trying, and not without success, to enter the workers movement. As far as the peasants are concerned, here the party has supported the proposal made by communist rural workers, the striving of the peasantry to create their own organization. These questions were given a preliminary discussion at the politburo of the Central Committee and in the agrarian commission of the party's Central Committee. An inaugural congress has been held and the Peasant Union has been formed.

It seems to me that the local party committees should give all-around support to this new gigantic, I would call it, social formation, the Peasants Union. I would like to note that the Peasants' Congress confirmed the importance of the alliance with the working class. So that the working class and the peasantry should be fully represented in soviet and party bodies, it is necessary to select and form from among the workers and peasants politically active fighters. And, possibly, comrades, at the start, even to establish for them certain quotas in the soviets and party committees.

Finally, two observations. I am extremely concerned at the fate of the decision of the March Central Committee plenum on ensuring the country a sufficiency of food-stuffs. I fully agree with all that has been said by the congress delegates on this question. The Russian countryside really is in a lamentable state. Comrades, rather paradoxical things have happened. Decisions were adopted, and it was even declared the top priority, but the countryside began to receive ever decreasing amounts of resources and machinery. There is almost no observable increase in agricultural output and the meat problem constantly gets worse.

People are justifiably indignant that there is no end to discussion of these problems but the situation does not improve. Our peasants do not understand why all their life they are in debt to all and why, working tirelessly from morning to night, they are unable to feed the country. Here, one cannot get by without restructuring collective and state farms. Here one cannot get by, no matter how difficult it may be for us, without increasing several-fold the equipment supply to the peasant and improving the social provision for the countryside. What is needed here is major, to say no more, capital investment. I have spoken about all of this before, I have said it now. That is my firm position.

[Lukyanov] Yegor Kuzmich, you have been speaking for 12 minutes; how much more do you need?

[Ligachev] In conclusion...just half a minute. Our party has constantly engaged in social policy. In conditions of a multiparty system, taking account of and implementing the interests of the working people assume special importance for the party. Its political fate and its prestige among the masses depend on this to a large extent.

Now, as never before, every practical step is very important, more important than a dozen programs. We are faced, comrades—I am just finishing—with many difficulties, many heavy trials. As they say, we knew what we were in for. I believe that a real festival will come onto our Soviet street. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Says Leadership Losing 'Democratism'

LD2006140690 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1317 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Yefimov from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun—Yegor Ligachev, a member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stated today at the inaugural congress of the Communist Party of Russia that the leadership of the CPSU has of late "begun to lose" its collectivity, democratism, and has stopped listening to opinions.

Obviously alluding to the combining of the posts of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR, Yegor Ligachev said: "One cannot lead the party, that leading force, without giving all one's time to it, or perhaps one can do without it?"

Speaking today at the debates, the CPSU Central Committee secretary expressed concern that many very important issues are not being discussed, either at the Politburo or at the Central Committee plenums. By way of example, he mentioned government measures regarding the transition to a market economy, an analysis of events in Eastern Europe, and the German question. "The socialist community has fallen apart, and the positions of imperialism have strengthened incredibly," he summed up.

Dwelling on the internal political situation, he stated that the party's strategy was aimed at the renewal of society, and that its main directions were correct. However, "large mistakes and great errors have been allowed in tactics, methods, and approaches to transformations."

"I think that, as a member of the Politburo, I had not appraised the danger for the policy of perestroika fully and with due adherence to principles, precisely the planned and ever increasing work of the anti-socialist forces to weaken and in the end to destroy the Communist Party and the socialist union of republics from within."

The speaker criticized the position of the Democratic Platform, describing it as "a fundamentally different party." He thinks that delimitation is "necessary" in the CPSU.

Yegor Ligachev supported the idea of a report by each member of the Politburo to the delegates of the 28th CPSU Congress, and stated that he would make such a report.

Comments on Future of Communism

LD2006214190 Moscow World Service in English
2010 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] [Announcer] A congress of the communists of Russia is under way in Moscow. Radio Moscow's reporter Sergey Vorobyev has interviewed a member of

the politburo of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, Yegor Ligachev during a break. We now bring you the interview:

What is your opinion of the congress of the Russian Communist Party so far?

[Begin Ligachev recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] It reflects better than any other congress the current sentiments in the party and society at large. The congress has been marked by a great deal of emotion just as the stormy processes under way in the country now have. Everybody's alarmed and concerned about the party, our motherland and our cause. It was this that has brought people to this congress.

There have been statements with which I agree fully. Other statements I don't fully share. But people concern(ed) about the future of the country, the party and the Soviet Federation were voicing their opinions. [end recording]

[Announcer] What is your relationship with Boris Yeltsin?

[Begin Ligachev recording] I have always tried to maintain our relations in keeping with the idea of party comradeship. There are quite a few people who perhaps would like to provoke a big quarrel between us, although both of us have done a great deal in that sense and I told Boris Nikolayevich as much when I congratulated him on his election chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia. [end recording]

[Announcer] The other day I saw a cartoon in a newspaper. Two men carry a stretcher with another man upon it to a mental clinic. The man on the stretcher cried "I do believe that the Soviet people, the present generation of the Soviet people, shall live under communism."

[Begin Ligachev recording] I believe that we will embark on the road of progress and reform in the end. [end recording]

[Announcer] Do you believe in communism?

[Begin Ligachev recording] Yes, I do. I believe in it as our ultimate goal. I believe that it would be wrong to bury communism now. They have tried to bury it time and again but it has continued to live for centuries. If we bury communism now we will have to go ahead and bury the whole working class. [end recording]

[Announcer] Anticommunist sentiments are very strong in the country now. Do you believe that it was right to hold another congress and another conference at this point in time?

[Begin Ligachev recording] This congress has not been convened by a decision of some group of people. It was called in response to the demands of communists of Russia, because the view is current in society and the

party that we must have a Communist Party of Russia. It would be very strange if politicians turn a deaf ear to that demand. [end recording]

[Announcer] Would you like to join the Communist Party of Russia?

[Second announcer giving Ligachev reply] Yes, of course, and I'm already a member of that party.

[Announcer] I'm a member of the Communist Party of the USSR. You also are a member of the Communist Party of the USSR. Now there emerges a Communist Party of Russia with its own leadership. Let us assume that I don't like you, and let us also assume that you don't like me. But I am a member of the leadership of the Communist Party of Russia, and therefore I automatically become your leader. What would be your attitude to such a situation?

[Begin Ligachev recording] I've never been guided by likes or dislikes in my life. I've always been guided by my principles. I believe that those who are guided by likes or dislikes should abandon party work and do bookkeeping instead. [end recording]

[Announcer] Do you believe that the formation of the Communist Party of Russia, now that centrifugal forces in the country are so strong, might lead to a split among communists?

[Begin Ligachev recording] No, I don't think so because I believe in the commitment to internationalism of Russia's communists and I also believe in the traditions of the Russian people who took them in with mother's milk. That is why I vote for the Russian Party. I'm sure that the communists of Russia will be more responsible and concerned for the integrity of our state. [end recording]

[Announcer] How do you understand the slogan: "Proletarians of all countries unite," now?

[Begin Ligachev recording] I understand it in the sense that the communist workers' movement must rally together and that it must not split. The more so since the retreat of socialism is in evidence in a number of regions of the world and in particular in Eastern Europe. That's my point of view. I'm very much concerned about that, just as all those present here are. Comrades present here have drafted a resolution of solidarity with communists of Eastern Europe and I have signed it.

Of course you cannot apply the same yardstick to all East European nations. But we must face the truth and acknowledge that socialism has suffered a defeat in this very important part of the world, but I am sure that this is a temporary setback and in the long run the socialist ideal will prevail. The socialist community has regrettably fallen apart and the forces of imperialism have become much stronger in Europe. That is my point of view. [end recording]

Ligachev Calls on Gorbachev To Step Down

AU2006141590 Paris AFP in English 1410 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 20 (AFP)—Soviet conservative hardliner Yegor Ligachev Wednesday called on Mikhail Gorbachev to quit as leader of the party.

"One cannot lead the party, the vanguard force, without giving it all one's time," he was quoted by TASS news agency as telling a congress of Russian communists here.

"Or perhaps, one can do without the party," he added.

Mr. Gorbachev as general-secretary and state president currently heads both the communist party and the country.

As a member of the politburo, the party's executive body, Mr. Ligachev said he too was responsible for recent mistakes, including that of not taking sufficient notice of "anti-socialist forces" who want to weaken and destroy the party and the Union from within.

Makashov Addresses 19 June Russian Conference

LD2006192690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2010 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Speech by Delegate Makashov from the Urals Military District, at the Russian Party Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June—recorded]

[Text] Comrade communists! Russia is living in troubled times. The whole tragedy lies in the fact that we have created this situation ourselves. Like Shakespeare's King Lear, who gave away his state to his dissolute daughters, we, too, can find ourselves in a similar tragedy. In my opinion the CPSU is now the only party which has greater concern for other parties than it has for itself. [applause] Our Armed Forces are one of the nerves of perestroika that have been laid bare. Of all the structures of society the army and the navy are, in their essence and in their form, the most vivid symbols of the state. Whoever wants to demolish the state to its foundations begins by defaming the armed forces, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB.

Citizen Arbatovs, Korotiches, Sobchaks, Gelmans, Yegor Yakovlevs, and company! Stand up and say it outright: We don't need the army. We can get by without the Armed Forces! [applause] Give a guarantee that there won't be any war, so that the people may know to whom it will be obliged for possible defeat in any conflict. And look carefully at history to see that conflicts or wars are possible. Why, otherwise, should the NATO bloc be being strengthened when the Warsaw bloc no longer exists? Germany is being reunited and will probably be a member of NATO. Japan is becoming the decisive force in the Far East. Only our own scientist-chaps twitter on about the fact that no one intends to attack us. [applause]

That formula is calculated to appeal to the feeble-minded. [applause]

Comrade communists! The army and the navy will yet stand the Union and Russia in good stead.

In any state people are brought to book in all kinds of ways for undermining the fighting ability of their own armed forces. If this is not done by the Government, then the people can stone the traitors. [applause]

The communists of the army and the navy are indignant over the lack of activity by the Central Committee, the Politburo and the Government with regard to those who defend them and with regard to those who trample on their own fighters and who stamp upon the concepts of patriotism and soldierly duty, concepts that are sacred for any people. Reducing your own Armed Forces unilaterally, using calculations and reasons unknown to the specialists, you do not have to spit on them first. Otherwise when the thunder rolls appeals and party mobilizations will be of no avail. It takes centuries to cultivate patriotism, but it is destroyed by the yellow press and by television in a couple of years. [applause]

Only a blind person or a criminal can fail to see this. [applause] The army is the least protected part of society, it is the most sacrificial part of it. It covered the death-dealing reactor of Chernobyl with the bodies of its own men, they died in the Hindu Kush and in Karabakh. Our Army never does anything by its own will. The army is led by politicians. Only once in history Marshal Zhukov saved Khrushchev, and not from some paper Stalinism, but from the living Beria. For this Khrushchev thanked—in inverted commas—the man who saved him and sent him into disgrace. And we communists with the new thinking are still unable to rehabilitate the great military commander.

We Armed Forces are of one flesh with our people. The ideological opponent does everything to drive a wedge between the privates and the officers, between the officers and the generals, as though these generals, before putting on their trousers with generals' stripes, had not spent 20 years and more alongside the soldiers getting wet, getting frozen, or carrying out combat or training tasks in blistering heat.

I am the commander of the troops of the Volga-Urals Military District. I was born the son of a soldier on additional voluntary service and a nurse. Colonel-General Pinkov, Boris Yevgeniyevich, the commander of the Siberian Military District, was born the son of deaf and dumb boot-makers. Isn't the concern of Soviet power for its Armed Forces the pinnacle of our democracy?

In IZVESTIYA the day before yesterday one B. Vasilyev regrets that our specialists are not of noble origins. But our grandfathers beat those members of the gentry on all fronts of the civil war. [applause] Our fathers beat the field marshals of fascism and we too could do the same.

We have been brought up on patriotism, internationalism and Leninism. Sixty-eight percent of the troops of the Soviet army are deployed on the territory of the

Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. The army party delegation represents more than 800,000 communists here. And we have no intention of giving in ideologically. At all party meetings and party conferences in the military district communist servicemen gave this mandate—that all attempts to depoliticize the Armed Forces should be opposed resolutely. And during these times which are troubled ones for the Union and for Russia, when because of the victories—the so-called victories—of our diplomacy the Soviet army is being driven without a fight out of countries which our fathers liberated from fascism, then the concern of the party and the people for the families of servicemen is essential.

Unfortunately in some oblast party organizations such concern is shown only in words. Six autonomous republics and 10 oblasts upon the territory of which are the troops of the military district have failed to provide 31,500 square meters of housing under shared participation arrangements for which we have paid money; and more than 72,000 square meters under the decision of the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers of 8 September 1984.

We understand that things are difficult for everyone. But believe me, the Armed Forces are not to blame for the fact that they are in such a difficult situation today. And in spite of everything we army communists cannot conceive the Union without Russia or Russia without the Union. And for this we are prepared to fight. [applause]

Makashov Resignation Urged

FM2006183190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
21 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Nadein article: "The Target of General Makashov's Allegations"]

[Text] In my view, the 19 June speech at the Russian party conference by General A.M. Makashov, commander of the Volga-Urals Military District, gives him every reason to immediately ask to retire. If no such request is forthcoming, I think the supreme commander in chief of the USSR Armed Forces, the USSR president, should demand one from the general.

Such a demand is not some kind of good deed by the president. It is his direct constitutional duty.

You certainly cannot describe A.M. Makashov's speech as soldierly in its forthrightness. On the contrary, the language is carefully chosen to convey everything without in any way overstepping the mark.

What exactly is "everything"? The fact that the district commander harshly and totally rejects the government's foreign and domestic policy: "I believe that this concept is designed for the feeble-minded"; "Only someone who is blind or criminal can fail to see that"; "We are being driven without a fight from the countries that our fathers liberated"...

When you read the transcript you notice that, despite the impression formed on television, this abuse is aimed at the perimeter of the target. At one moment "deaf scientists" come under fire. At the next the "yellow" press. Then "the Citizen Arbatovs, Korotiches, Sobchaks, Gelmans, Yegor Yakovlevs, and company." Then those who are driving people "without a fight" from their own countries.

But this is just camouflage. What have Sobchaks to do with it? A single platoon could easily deal with the Arbatovs and Korotiches. It is perfectly clear what "bull's-eye" is the target of the assertion that the army party organization "is not going to surrender ideologically." That target is perestroika.

There is no need to obediently follow the twists and turns of the commander's logic. Indeed, he himself is not planning, by way of "ideological" battle, to open up army agitation centers everywhere, to set up an all-Russian army television service with its own ideological programs, or to drop leaflets from bombers. But it is not for nothing that his speech mentions Zhukov, who once saved Khrushchev from Beria. A transparent hint?

The harshness of the general's criticism is not the point. Still less its personal thrust. A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of Kemerovo Party Obkom [oblast committee], actually demanded the resignation of the Central Committee and the Politburo. That is his right. A right that we all must defend. Even if we all do not agree.

However, Gen. Makashov did not merely criticize. He demonstrated a clear failure to understand the army's mission in a rule-of-law state. Forget what precisely he said about the threat of a NATO attack on the USSR or the claim that Japan "is becoming" the decisive military force in the Far East. All that is naive stuff even for an ensign. But that is a personal matter until such time as talk turns to the use of the Armed Forces contrary to the will of the legally elected organs of power, or the threat to use them.

"The Army and Navy communists are angry at the inaction of the Central Committee, the Politburo, and the government regarding their own defenders," A.M. Makashov said. And he thereby raised a question: Does a man who believes that the army is created in order to defend the Central Committee, the Politburo, and the government have the right to lead the Armed Forces in a vast region of Russia?

It has always been hard to serve in the Army. Especially nowadays. The difficulties that the country is experiencing inevitably affect the fate of the Army with the world's largest contingent of generals. But when, using the imperishability of ideology as camouflage, a general, to tumultuous applause from his colleagues, essentially presents an ultimatum to the president, parliament, and the society which he is supposed to serve faithfully and unquestioningly, the time has come for subordination according to the regulations.

Once he has taken off his shoulder boards and withdrawn from the command of hundreds of thousands of servicemen, anybody is entitled to demand any changes in domestic policy, any foreign policy volte-faces and personnel changes.

On the same footing as other unarmed citizens.

Tyulkin Addresses 19 June Russian Conference

LD2006154690 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1845 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Speech by Comrade Tyulkin delivered on behalf of Leningrad Initiative Congress of Russian Communists at the Russian party conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congress in Moscow on 19 June—recorded]

[Text] Comrade communists! Thank you very much, all present, [word indistinct] friends and democrats, for allowing me to address you. I speak on behalf of the Initiative Congress of Communists of Russia which took place in two stages in Leningrad and represented more than 1.5 million members of our party. It evoked, I would say, immense interests, and at the same time, a varied reaction both in the party and in society. What is it all about? What was said, where is the truth, and why has this initiative from below received, on the one hand, the harshest criticism from certain political forces, especially the mass media, while on the other hand, I would say a stopper has been put on information on the part of the party press and official party structures.

My comrades have instructed me to state straight away with party-style directness, which is typical of us, that we are not any particular platform within the CPSU. The aim of the Initiative Congress of the Communists of Russia was the organization of a strong movement from below for the creation of the Russian Communist Party. Why? Because the messages from rank-and-file communists, from primary party organizations, and from whole regional, oblast, rayon organizations, were not meeting with support from the center, they brought a reaction either of inaction, with a lack of any reaction, or else the reaction was, to say the least, quite peculiar. You all know well enough what we are talking about. And so we stress once again: The initiative movement to create the Russian Communist Party is not any platform. The matter concerns first and foremost the completion of the organizational unification of the communists of our republic, and solely within the framework of the CPSU, solely with a unified program, and solely with unified rules and with a single party card. At the same time, it is understandable that the issue of the formation of a Russian Communist party cannot only be linked with and boiled down to organizational questions, although here too there are enough pros and cons, and Mikhail Segeyevich has spoken about this in detail, but to reduce this just to organizational shape is not possible. Why not? Because nobody sitting in this hall, I am certain, nor any of the local communists can be at all satisfied with a simple organizational shaping, with a mechanical

transfer of the situation of disorder and vacillation which is to be observed today in our party.

And so, it is a communist party on Leninist foundations that the initiative movement has been pursuing right from the start. And I must note, with satisfaction, that we have found total mutual understanding with the organizational committee which prepared for today's conference, and we found things in common on all the basic points that were set forth in the report of the chairman, Comrade Osadchiy. All the same, why did the holding of the initiative congress bring such an unambiguous reaction? What is behind this? From our point of view, the main thing is to determine the party's aims, and to determine why it exists and where it is calling the working people to. Whether the people will trust it, will follow it, and whether its prestige will be enhanced depends on this, and in the final analysis whether it will be a vanguard party or one taking the rear depends on this, not on what we write in our program documents. Even once we have determined what it is for, we could talk about how to construct our work—to make the ties vertical, or horizontal, along or across, and in which direction to move democratic socialism. These are derivatives. Some comrades who think most pessimistically, I would say—but perhaps they are the most realistic—even express suppositions that if things go a certain way, then it could happen that in places they will even have to go underground.

Returning to the main question of what the party is for, here too, in particular yesterday at the conference of representatives of delegations, the idea was put forward that at today's stage the party has become too carried away with theorizing, and that it does not provide anything as an outcome, it does not give directives and recommendations on evaluating today's situation in society and in the party. I think one can agree only with part of this proposition, that indeed the party does not provide anything as an outcome, but it is not possible to agree that it is too bound up with theoretical issues. If it has proved possible to draw the party into something, then it is not by any means into theoretical discussions, but—perhaps this is a crude way of putting it, but excuse me—it is into internal party squabbling, to which the majority of the people are far from indifferent. The theoretical work in the party is not abeyance, and precisely because the general questions are not being tackled, we in fact stumble when resolving particular, tactical questions, and disorder and vacillation can be seen among us.

Moreover, in our point of view, a kind of mandatory, I would call it new restructuring dogmatism, has been established in the party today on a whole range of issues. Where before there was no alternative to developed socialism and the economical economy of intensification, now there exists no alternative to that version of perestroika which is being put into practice. Returning to this main issue, what are the main theses on which disagreements exist, which were precisely what was

talked about at the initiative congress? First, this concerns the dogmatic interpretation of the slogan about the priority of common human values over class ones, and the rejection of the simplified class approach. It would seem that this does not evoke any objections from anybody—although it is not clear what the class values and interests of a worker, let's say, or of an engineer are which run counter to common human ones, and why they should be contrasted. However, under this slogan, what goes on is virtually a rejection by the party of a class analysis, a class approach, as a tool. Hence the next question which is posed, that of how our perestroika is going, are its target-oriented functions now being distorted, is it oriented towards the interests of the majority of rank-and-file working people, or, as fashionable economists love to express themselves these days, should it be oriented towards the interests of a narrow group of people who are enterprising and know how to work and to make money?

Or take this point: Why is there no analysis anywhere in party documents of the stratification of society which is taking place? It is taking place, according to how much one owns, and it is very powerful. And on this basis, new political forces are emerging, they exist, including within the CPSU itself, they may have a definite shape or none, may have a name or not, but they are operating actively, and they are operating, it must be noted, drawing support from centralism. They have no particular need of democratization at the present moment. In fact, they make every effort to foist various kinds of demagogery on the party in the context of democratization, and to draw it into endless discussion.

The question also concerns, in the final analysis, the social basis of the party. After all, the working people keenly sense the social injustice which is being created, and it is precisely because of this that workers are deserting the party. They have already begun to calculate these processes in terms of percentages. At Kirovskiy Zavod [enterprise in Leningrad], this year alone more than 70,000 people left the party, mostly workers. Before I left to come here, I chatted with the secretary of the party committee at LOMO [enterprise] about why he was so sad, and he said he had 400 resignation letters to deal with, mostly workers. We must sound the alarm.

Another thesis: We are talking about the dogmatic interpretation of the thesis of pluralism, primarily within the party. Certain people are moved by it, how good it is, they say, how we have developed democratic processes! What pluralism! Members of our party lead both the left-wingers and the right-wingers, both the United Front of Working People and the People's Front of Working People, both those who are for communism and those who are against communism, all of them are members of our party. [applause] And the person who observes this from the top and says, "Good! Pluralism!" is the party's main ideologist. [applause]

Some people reproach us with trying again to reduce matters to notorious like-mindedness, and they immediately present things as if like-mindedness is when everybody has the one idea, and nobody has anything else in their heart. May I assure you that this is far from the way things are. We should have a single aim, and there should be a multitude, perhaps an infinity of approaches in implementing it. But here we should be united, and the main task for the communist party at the moment is to eliminate the period of disorder and vacillation that we have now.

I shall dwell on another point which is a very painful experience for the majority of communists, and it is probably a decisive one. The matter concerns the interpretation of the slogan "all power to the soviets!". Nobody has any objection, everyone is in favor, and me first of all. But what I would like to say is that, having put forward this slogan, the party leadership, which incidentally gained great advantage in the elections to the highest bodies from public organizations, brought the party to the election campaign in a unprepared state. And we are supposed to be glad when there are members of the party in all structures as never before, but the party virtually does not conduct its line in the soviets through the communists. And so, we reckon that it is an urgent necessity today, and this should be reflected in the new draft rules, to have not a wish, but an obligation to have party factions operating in all soviets at all levels, while the mechanism of tying up the party faction with the party line and with the party organization should all be prescribed in the rules. I think we will have the opportunity to talk about the mechanism.

I will dwell on one more point, and then finish. There is a thesis—it arouses no objections, either—about the absence and the impossibility of adhering to rigid, inflexible models of the society that we are building. Agreed, it is correct. But what is justified under this stamp is the absence of clear plans, even for the near future. This being so, there ensues from this a lack of responsibility for implementation of them. Meanwhile, the general secretary of our party has noted repeatedly in his speeches that those who propose quick and easy ways are simply political swindlers. Is that so? Yes, it is. But I think that we should also make a ruling in party terms about those who have already given promises to the people for the coming two or three years. These deadlines have been moved back, but these promises have not been fulfilled. [applause]

In the sphere of economic policy, one should not think that the initiative congress defined some uniform, rigid policy, some say against perestroika and economic reform, harking back to the past. This is not so. We primarily talked about the fact that under the slogan of changing the functions of the party, we must under no circumstances avoid working out the socio-economic policy. Were that to happen, the party would not be any use to anybody, what is it for? [applause] But since the matter concerns working out the policy, then there is a legitimate question: Why, today, at a sharp turn in the

economic policy being carried out in the name of the party, has nobody consulted with us, with the rank and file communists? And it is not a case of someone calling for the party to start handing out commands and determining how much of what should be produced where, and by whom. No, the matter concerns what political organization is going to take on the responsibility for the possible results. We have already been through this. For example, the maize campaign, the anti-alcohol struggle, the campaign for cooperatives, and so on and so forth. That is what we are talking about, primarily.

I am coming to the end of my speech, comrades, and I would like to finish off with these words, that of course, today the situation on the issue of formation of the Russian Communist Party is not what it was, for instance, on 3 April, when the preparatory committee gathered for the first time and when the majority of members of the Russian Bureau and central committee secretaries were categorically against it. Now, already, the majority has worked out its opinion. The majority is for it. But, today, there will, anyway, be many speeches which will also express themselves against it, and will put all kinds of checks on this process; they will attempt to put off elections to the leading party bodies until later and will put forward many reasons. But we are profoundly convinced that all these reasons, by and large, can be reduced to two, and come from two main categories of idea, if you like. The first is that a given comrade pronounces the word "Russian" badly. [applause] And, secondly, they frankly do not want to pronounce the word "communist."

Comrade communists of our republic, unite! [applause]

Kolganov Outlines Marxist Platform at Conference

*LD2006123790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1829 GMT 19 Jun 90*

[Report by RSFSR Deputy Kolganov, on behalf of the Marxist Platform of the CPSU, at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Communist Party Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow, on 19 June—recorded]

[Text] Comrades! We have put forward the Marxist platform, not for the purpose of becoming an opposition to the party or creating a basis for knocking up a separate organization. We have strictly limited ourselves to a single task: To draw the Communists' attention to a number of problems which were not covered or were insufficiently clearly covered in other drafts. I am addressing the delegates in order to say this: Whether or not the Russian Federation will have a renewed, viable Communist Party capable of winning the confidence of the working people depends on our decisions. In order to solve this task the party must first draw up a program to pull out of the crisis, a program which would enjoy the trust of the people and prove its capability for implementing this program. Second, the party must unite its members around clear ideas of socialism and the future of Communist which correspond to the realities of the

modern world. Third, for the party to be able to solve these two tasks and to advance together with the people rather than lead the people, it must radically change the old organizational foundations and political traditions of party work.

On the first question, no suitable anti-crisis program has yet been submitted. The proposals of the union government for transition to a regulated market economy do perhaps go in the right direction, but they suffer from a number of fundamental flaws. In fact, they only slightly open the door to a market economy, leaving the bureaucratic economic superstructure largely untouched. At the same time, the movement toward a market economy is not supported by guarantees that this economy will serve the interests of the majority of the people, the interests of working people. The main thing here lies not in budgetary compensation for those who suffer from the reform, and not in supplements for rising prices. The main thing is that the economic mechanism itself should contain guarantees against undesirable events, against blows to the well-being of the people.

For us, the matter is not whether there is to be a market or not, but what the market will be like—a bureaucratically corrupt one or a truly democratically regulated one, civilized or not civilized. And for us the market is not an end in itself, not a terminus, but a step along the way toward a more progressive economic set-up. A positive solution to this problem is possible only if all the economic levers for influencing the market are not in the hands of economic bureaucrats, but in the hands of workers.

What do we have in mind? The independence which it is expected to give to enterprises should belong not just to the corps of directors, but first and foremost to labor collectives. Production self-management should not be wound up, but strengthened. Economic problems which go beyond the framework of individual collectives must be resolved by free collective associations and not by official departments. Mass democratic workers' organizations both the traditional trade unions, which need renovation, and the independent ones, and workers' committees and associations of them like the confederation of labor, should acquire the main role in determining conditions of employment, should supervise the discharging and redeploying of personnel, their training and retraining, the creation of new jobs, job placement and, in connection with this, housing rights for workers who are transferred. Federations of consumer societies could tackle the issues of price control and the quality of consumer products, and supervise the observance of trading rules, and in the long term they could act as major wholesale customers for consumer goods production. The economic power of the soviets must finally be turned from fiction into reality.

The resolution of problems of housing construction and housing allocation, of housing and municipal services, must be torn from the hands of official departments, as must those of health care and education, of consumer

services, of local transport, the use of plots of land, and so on. One would think that organizations such as ecological unions, creative unions, and others could find a place in the constructive resolution of economic problems. Organs of territorial self-government, committees for public self-government, and local soviets must gain [words indistinct] rights in providing all living conditions for the population. Statewide measures in the sphere of the economic regulation of the market economy must be drafted and adopted by the supreme organs of state power, with the mandatory involvement of representatives of labor collectives and mass worker organizations.

The problems of drafting and implementing statewide economic programs must be tackled in just the same way, with there having to be alternatives in the decisions being made. Naturally, there are inevitably going to be costs in any sharp turn toward a new economic mechanism. But in order to reduce them to a minimum, we have to enhance the efficiency of mechanisms of social protection. Real rights must be granted in administering the relevant resources to associations of those who need the protection, to the organizations of invalids, pensioners, veterans, youth, women, and so on. The turning of workers' organs of production and territorial self-government and of democratic public organizations into a mass base of soviets at all levels will make them true organs of the majority power, and not an elite of professional politicians. The practical implementation of all these measures would make it possible to lay foundations for the transition to a market economy to be not an aim in itself, but to serve the interests of the people. I am saying nothing here of the special problems of the Russian Federation, because I consider that the resolution of these problems, which the whole union has in common, is the best guarantee for political and economic stability, both for the whole union and for Russia.

On the second issue: If we remain a Communist Party, we are obliged to determine how we view socialism and a Communist future. So far there is nothing definite here, and this exacerbates the ideological party disorder. Even the draft Central Committee platform, which has tried to elucidate in detail the question of humane, democratic socialism, elucidated it in its first version in such a way that it became more like a pre-election promise than a clear theoretical concept of our future society. The official social sciences, which earlier used to justify the cult of the personality and stagnation, are now ready to support any political vacillations. Evidence of this is in the absence of a clear concept of movement toward socialism. Our task is not to paint pictures in rosy hues and not to impose some norms or other to which reality has to be made to conform. We must give specific answers to specific questions which are presently of concern to everybody. Of course, it would be difficult to expect that we will now suddenly be able to bring complete clarity to these issues. Intense work is still needed here, and we need discussion.

Finally, the third question, the question of the principles of the structure and functioning of the Party. It is important for us not for its own sake, but only insofar as the Party's capacity to find ways to resolve all the problems which are currently worrying the people depends on the organization of the Party. The Communist Party has to become a genuinely voluntary alliance of like-thinkers. The heavy legacy of bureaucratic command in the party has to be left in the past. We have to break with bureaucratic centralism, but no political organization can operate without centralism and without discipline.

Naturally, the right to adopt mandatory decisions has to be left to general assemblies, conferences, and congresses. Party committees and bureaus should be formed only for coordinating the work of party organizations and to implement decisions made. What is adopted by the majority of Party members must be implemented. But the minority must be given certain guarantees. They must be granted the right to criticize the decisions which they consider mistaken, and the right to organize platforms. But, at the same time, we oppose the creation of factions, and we consider that the rules should give a sufficiently clear definition of factions which, on the one hand, would not permit any ideological platform existing within the Party to be made the basis of a faction, and at the same time, would not allow the possibility of the Party being torn into individual pieces. Party organizations must be truly autonomous in settling local issues. Their resolution, with the exception of decisions on excluding people from the Party, must not be annulled by anybody.

Equality of principles in forming primary Party organizations must be established, not only the formation on production or territorial lines, but also on the functional lines of associations by interest through the nature of professional activity or some other way. This does not mean that work in labor collectives should be wound up. On the contrary. At the same time however, there is a need for a drastic intensification of work according to place of residence and on territorial principles, particularly in connection with elections to bodies of power in the conditions of a multi-party system, which is approaching. There is a need to step up work in various mass organizations and in various movements. The fact that we so far do not, regrettably, have any such mass work, neither according to territory nor with mass organizations and movements, nor according to nature of production work, is evidenced by the signs which are emerging of workers' mass resignation from the party. The Party budget, its sources and expenses, must be open to members of the Party. Decisions on the structure, size, and finance of leading bodies, and the technical apparatus should be resolved by party organizations.

The party must be capable of political dialogue and political alliances with other parties and movements. This is especially important now when the country's dangerous slide into social confrontation must be averted. Of course, we must first of all reach out to those

who do not reject the socialist choice. We are presently faced with an alternative: to turn into a former party, a party of former state employees, or to go to the masses, work among the masses and together with the masses, share their interests, defend their interests, and incorporate them into state policy.

About our work here: I understand the desire of many delegates to come to the 28th congress having their own Russian Central Committee. However, I think that a Central Committee can only be elected when the position of the potential political leaders, according to the provisions of the program and the rules, is elucidated. Can we elect a Party Central Committee when the party itself has not been sufficiently defined? The final self-determination will take place at the 28th Congress, and then it will be clear who is who. What is more important for us—to create the higher bodies as soon as possible, or to use all the party forum's potential to work out an effective Communist policy? We have proclaimed the power of the party masses, but are we not now leaving these Party masses out of things when determining the composition of the leadership? And so, we must definitely postpone elections to the Central Committee until the second stage, after the 28th congress.

Communists throughout the country and not only individual delegations must have the opportunity to sort things out, find out where they stand, and establish who is who. [applause]

And so I address you again with a reminder of our common responsibility. Comrades! The party is presently in a crisis. Many people are leaving the party. It was not in order to take part in the funeral of the Communist movement in Russia that I became a member of the CPSU three months ago. I expect that your position is similar. Now, to use the words of Lenin: It is not enough to be a supporter of socialist or a communist in general; you have to know which link in the chain has to be grasped in order to pull out the whole chain. How much of a Communist you are is now proven not by proclamation of fidelity to the old approaches and slogans. One must understand that the most important thing now is a profound democratic renewal of the Party, the rejection of political monopoly, of political and property privilege. [applause] One must see clearly that a danger exists of sliding into a communist sect whose members will repeat from time to time their fidelity to Marx, Engels, and Lenin, but will turn out to be incapable in their efforts to make communist policy the policy of the working masses.

I would like to add that after the floor here has been given to representatives of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU and the Marxist Platform in the CPSU, it would be logical to also hear out the representatives of the Leningrad initiative congress of the Russian Communist Party, who have proposed their own draft platform for the Russian Party conference. I thank all the delegates for the opportunity to speak to you, and for your attention. [applause]

Moscow Party Leader Assesses Conference

LD2006162990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1455 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandras Budris and Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)—The issue of setting up the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party was predetermined even before the start of the conference of the communists of the biggest USSR republic, according to Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU. He was speaking this morning at a meeting with Soviet and foreign journalists in the press center of the party conference, which has already constituted itself as the founding congress of the Russian Communist Party. [passage omitted]

Replying to a question on the prospects of Yegor Ligachev heading the RSFSR Communist Party, the Moscow communist boss said that this candidacy has not been considered anywhere, including at conferences of representatives of regional organizations.

Leader Interviewed

LD2006212590 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 20 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The first assessments of the work of the Russian party conference were given today at a press conference by members of the delegation of Moscow communists. It was organized for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Comrade Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City party committee, noted the democratic nature of the forum, at which representatives of all currents and platforms in the party have received the opportunity to present their program statements.

[Correspondent V. Stefanov—identified by caption] Negative aspects of the work of the conference were also mentioned. In Comrade Prokofyev's view this is above all the excessive criticism directed at the party leadership. Yes, many mistakes had been made, Comrade Prokofyev said. Criticism is well-founded, but not to the extent as is being voiced at the conference. The way out of the situation which has arisen in the country and in the CPSU is via the democratization of the party, the leader of the capital's party organization stated, and he expressed regret in connection with the fact that not all delegates to the conference understand this. The member of the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee adopted a self-critical attitude toward the bureau's work in preparing for the conference.

Journalists' questions on the whole concerned the position of the future Russian Communist Party inside the CPSU and the nature of the CPSU in the near future. Journalists were of course interested in the possible candidate leaders of the republican communist party.

Comrade Prokofyev's personal view was that the post of first secretary could be taken up by Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin. A question was also asked as to whether the leader of the Moscow party organization does not see a threat of party policy turning to the right.

[Prokofyev] Taking into account the situation in the country, a negative situation, a situation when society is in crisis—in the past five years we have received almost no improvement in life—in such a situation a shift to the right is possible. And, unfortunately, my forecasts, so to speak, are coming true. Because, if one is objective, to a certain extent, a shift to the right is now taking place at the conference, at the congress.

I don't intend speaking at the conference, but I intend speaking at the 28th party congress. I believe that in progress now is, well, the creation of a new party, which is still to discuss its problems, its questions. The main struggle, to give it a name, will unfold at the 28th party congress.

Communist Party Favored

LD2006173890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1455 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandras Budris and Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)—The issue of setting up the Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic was predetermined even before the start of the conference of the communists of the biggest of the USSR republics, according to Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of Moscow City Committee of the CPSU. He spoke this morning at a meeting with Soviet and foreign journalists in the press center at the party conference, which has already constituted itself as the founding Congress of the Russian Communist Party.

Yuriy Prokofyev announced that 75 percent of the Moscow delegation favored the formation of an RSFSR Communist party on the eve of the holding of the conference. There was a similar situation in other regions, too. In the view of the leader of the Moscow communists, the main question now is what the party will be like. "If the Russian party takes dogmatic stands, its place will be occupied by other, more radical, more progressive political forces," Yuriy Prokofyev stressed. In his opinion, the question of the nature of the future party must be definitively resolved after the 28th CPSU Congress. Before it, Russian communists can only amalgamate regional organizations.

Yuriy Prokofyev noted that, at the recent Moscow City party conference, there had been a consolidation of its participants on democratic positions. At the forum of communists of Russia, the overwhelming majority of delegates did not, he thought, share these positions. He proposed that if the trend toward democratization did not intensify then "the question of a party split may well be placed" on the agenda of the 28th congress. In that

case, the leader of Moscow's communists declared, he would prefer a split whereby "the centrists and left-centrists remained united."

Touching on the USSR's transition toward a regulated market, Yuriy Prokofyev expressed doubt over whether, in the next two years, it would be possible to achieve any positive results in extricating the country's economy from crisis. Nevertheless, he noted, the program put before the Congress of People's Deputies indicated the right direction in principle, but needed additional work to see that the transition from a planned economy to the market was not very painful. Replying to a question on the prospects of Yegor Ligachev heading the Communist Party of the RSFSR, the Moscow communist boss said that this candidacy has not been considered anywhere, including at conferences of representatives of regional organizations.

Leningrad Party Leader Addresses Conference

*LD2006130790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2000 GMT 19 Jun 90*

[Speech by Gidasov, first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee, at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Communist Party Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrades, today we are present at a very important—I would like to use the hackneyed words historical event—the revival of the Russian Communist Party. The whole course of the sociopolitical, and social and economic development of the country, and the complex and contradictory processes taking place in the union republics and in the federation itself has led us to recognize the need for this step.

However, an even more weighty incentive for consolidating the ranks of communists was the deepening situation of crisis in the CPSU. The substitution of the party's democratization with insidious internal party reforms, the absence of an ideological concept of perestroika—all this caught the party unawares when the destructive fire of accusations was opened up on it.

The present position of the Secretariat, the Politburo, and the Central Committee of the CPSU and their actual remoteness from some of the most important political events taking place in the country raises a large number of perplexing questions. At hand is a process of turning the CPSU into a conglomerate of factional formations.

We see that various disagreements exist on the issue of the political idea of restoring the Russian Communist Party. It appears that the main task of our conference is to leave aside the settling of accounts between supporters of various approaches and to find a happy medium which, perhaps, will not satisfy all those present, most likely it will not satisfy them, but which will receive understanding and support from the people and the majority of communists.

I see the Russian Communist Party as one of the most radical and progressive communist parties of the union republics, otherwise it is not worth creating it. To this end, we have to reject all kinds of dogmatic concepts about the role of the party, and to shelve many obsolete slogans and declarations. The Russian Communist Party should show an example of organization, dynamism, and cohesion and should act as a party of civic peace and accord.

The radicalism of the Russian Communist Party should be manifest in all spheres, and first in the sphere of creating a new system of relations between the union republics. For this purpose, alongside the expression of national interests, the Russian Communist Party should concentrate on elaborating an ideology that would be acceptable to all republican parties defending the interests of the working people.

In these difficult days, when political is becoming civil confrontation, when blood is being split, and when armed extremist and nationalistic-minded armed groupings have appeared in the republics, we, as has long been our lot in Russia, have to get to work and show wisdom and the patience inherent in Russians in times of harsh ordeals, so that our multinational power may know and feel that it has a point of support it can rely on at a difficult time.

And we should not forget that as we speak the word "Russia", we are at the same time thinking about the many nationalities and autonomies which populate the RSFSR. Therefore, built into the program and rules of the Russian Communist Party, which will without doubt be based on the program and rules of the CPSU, there should be those formulations and definitions that have strengthened the self-awareness of the nationalities and autonomies within the framework of Russia and within the framework of the Russian Communist Party, have facilitated free development, and strengthened internationalism.

At the recent conference of our oblast party organization, a political statement by Leningrad communists to the 28th Congress of the CPSU was adopted, which lays down our vision of the political prospects for society and the extent of our involvement in the processes taking place.

In the first instance, what are under discussion are ways of overcoming the party's isolation from the realities of perestroika, and its role and place in a society undergoing renewal. It appears that this document could be taken as a basis for determining the political priorities of the Russian communists, if PRAVDA publishes it, of course. Evidently, the party which is being revived has to define itself and its ideology and declare its basic principles and sources. This all the more important under conditions when communist ideology, represented in vulgar form and artificially planted in previous years, is nowadays perceived in the mass consciousness as anti-scientific. Communists are faced with prolonged work to

restore the propaganda of the principles of their philosophy, and to rid it of hare-brained social schemes and utopianism.

The Leningrad communists regard the communist perspective not as a model of depersonalized humanism, but as the embodiment in the historical future of the ideal of the spiritual freedom of the individual and social justice which has been achieved by humanity through suffering.

But the party is a political force only when, without losing its historical perspectives, it presents society with a range of topical goals close to everyone. We have to hold our course, to work out a policy which is attractive because of its concrete results and not its rainbow prospects.

Ultimately, people will judge us not as how we decide internal party problems but in terms of how realistically the social and economic program is implemented.

The Leningrad communists see the way of getting out of the social and economic crisis in the implementation of the economic freedom of citizens, on the basis of state, leasing, collective, individual labor, and private forms of property having equal rights, and constitutionally guaranteeing their inviolability.

We have to accurately represent the interests of groups of the population whom we express and defend. The foundation of the party's social base was and remains the working class.

I support the proposals made here that our conference should state its powers as a constituent congress which has the right to elect both the secretariat of the Russian Communist Party and members of the central committee. Here indeed, perhaps running somewhat ahead of events, I should say that in our view it is necessary to delegate working people to the central committee, mainly representatives of the more skilled portion of workers and peasants, of engineering and technical workers, and of the creative intelligentsia, and only the minimum number of released party workers. [applause]

Primary party organizations and rank-and-file communists should be broadly represented within the central committee of the Russian Communist Party. At the initiative congress of the Russian Communist Party in Leningrad, in many speeches by delegates there was discussion of defending the values of Soviet history, of Lenin's theoretical legacy, and of the socialist and longer-term interests of the working class and of all working people.

However, in the resolutions of the initiative congress all this found its own unjustifiably extreme expression. An apologia for the past is perceptible in them. There is no profound analysis of the causes of the deformation of socialism. The resolutions are basically constructed on Lenin's theses from the days of acute class struggle and civil war, the logic of which is unacceptable for our

times. Chauvinist themes incompatible with Leninism are also discernible. There are also concrete proposals on the procedure for forming the leading bodies of the Russian Communist Party and the procedure for our future work.

I think that we now have to elect a secretariat and that part of the central committee which the congress will define—maybe one quarter or one third—to prepare the second stage of our forum, and after it has started, to elect the remaining members of the central committee of the Russian Communist Party to ensure that there is an opportunity to consult with primary party organizations.

Currently, the country has unfortunately turned into a vast meeting hall. Throughout the country, passions are boiling at various congresses, forums, conferences, and meetings. Tense debates are under way in organizational committees and [word indistinct] committees. Statements, manifestoes, and platforms are being elaborated. There are no longer enough television channels or newspaper pages to cover all this universal hubbub.

Is it not time to wonder whether or not we need the vainglorious reputation of being the most meeting-bound nation in the world? The time has now come for action. And it is precisely our conference which should demonstrate constructiveness, purposefulness, and the ability to generate ideas, to embody them in programs and to implement what has been planned.

A time of worry gives rise to despair, but the latter also gives rise to great courage capable of giving hope. May the congress of the Russian communists be a congress of civic hope. Thank you. [applause]

Ryzhkov Speaks on Party Renewal Process

*LD1906143890 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0705 GMT 19 Jun 90*

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jun (TASS)—MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA today publishes the address by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the recent 28th conference of the Moscow city CPSU organization.

The preconference discussion has shown that we have not managed to overcome serious ideological and political disagreements, there is still no single opinion on many fundamental issues, and there are conflicting, sometimes irreconcilable viewpoints. Nikolay Ryzhkov stated in his address at the conference.

"I would like to mention particularly one of the country's most important political events—the Russian Party Conference. It will decide an issue that will have a direct influence on the future of the CPSU. In setting up a Russian Communist Party we must understand fully that the structure of the entire party and the principle of its work will depend on this step and this must be taken into

consideration in the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress. Indeed the consolidating role of Russia is invaluable in the fate of our country. This has been the case and will continue to be so."

"The renewal of our party is an extremely complex process. It will have to reform itself from a structure that has taken shape over decades. It will have to be resolute in casting off all its layers of dogma and outmoded political principles and learn to work with other parties and movements, defending its positions in a fierce struggle."

"In brief, for any party this means adhering to its aim—in this case to socialism in its new guise. If we have no clear aims the people will not be behind us. The vacuum will be filled by other movements and parties with their own clearly defined aims."

"As for reflecting the interests of the social environment with which we are organically linked, we think that these are the interests of the working people and primarily the interests of the working class, rural workers, the intelligentsia, and office workers, all of whom will be attracted by our ideals."

"It is a question of methods of political campaigning for power. We will have to be very serious about learning that. Finally, we must build and operate on broad democratic principles."

Conference Discusses Role of Russian Party

LD2006161990 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Vorontsov and Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Discussion at the Constituent Congress of the Russian Communist Party focused today on what kind of a party it should be.

Participants in the discussion, which continues for the second day, were practically unanimous in their opinion that the Russian Communist Party should be created within the framework and on the basis of programme documents and the rules of the renovated Soviet Communist Party. "The party should not be pulled apart on the basis of the nationalities principle," said Chechen-Ingush party chief Doku Zavgayev.

As for the social basis of the party, most speakers believe that the party should rely on working people and uphold their interests. "It can acquire a personality of its own and win people's confidence only by proclaiming this support," said Yuriy Kopylov, a driver from Magadan. Nikolay Yefremenko, a worker from Belgorod, Central Russia, suggested that a 50 per cent quota for workers and peasants at the Central Committee be recorded in the party rules.

Representatives of the Democratic Platform proposed on Tuesday that the Russian Communist Party be turned

into a parliamentary party and reject communist ideas. The proposals were not supported by the majority of delegates.

Delegates also turned down a proposal to eliminate party organisations at industrial enterprises, the Army, interior ministry, and state security institutions. Nikolay Boyko, head of the political department of the anti-aircraft troops, said that in the current difficult situation in the army, political authorities are more necessary than ever. He believes that leaving the Army without communists would weaken its defence potential.

There is no political force in the country today that could replace the Soviet Communist Party, said Lyudmila Ishchuk, secretary of a collective farm party cell from the Kirov region, Northern Russia. This idea was expressed at the congress on more than one occasion. Vladimir Okhokhonin, a party functionary from Kurgan, said that "without the party's support in the provinces the laws that are now being adopted by the Soviet will not work."

By this morning 173 delegates asked to take the floor. However, it is clear that they will not all have time to speak, despite the congress's decision to prolong the working day by one hour.

TASS Reports on 20 June Russian Conference

LD2006124490 Moscow TASS in English 1227 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Vorontsov and Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The Russian party conference which opened in Moscow on Tuesday, today decided to be transformed into the founding congress of the Russian Communist Party.

Chairman of the Credentials Committee Gennadiy Khodyrev told the morning meeting that 2,768 delegates elected by party organisations of the Russian Federation are authorised to participate in the congress.

Describing the delegates' corps, he noted that the recent fall in workers' and peasants' participation in state bodies and elective party bodies has not been avoided during the election.

There are only 264 workers among the delegates, or 9.5 per cent, and only 118 collective farmers, 4.3 per cent.

The chairman of the Credentials Committee supported the decision of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and its Russian Bureau to invite 200 more communists, workers and collective farmers to the congress.

After endorsing the delegates' credentials, the congress discussed the status of the 200 for over half an hour. It has been decided by a majority vote to grant them a deliberative vote at the constituent congress.

The debate then continued. Just as yesterday, all the speakers supported the creation of a Russian Communist Party. Criticism also continued. Many delegates criticise the leadership of the Soviet Communist Party for not keeping abreast of events and for weak ties with primary organisations.

The speech of first secretary of the Krasnodar territorial party committee Ivan Polozkov is characteristic of the debate. He believes that the leadership's "inconsistency in matters of principle, lavish promises, tardiness about making serious decisions and inability to correct errors promptly show that the leadership lacks a clear-cut programme for socialism's renewal."

Polozkov cites the crisis in the party's leading bodies—not with the Soviet party itself—as the reason why many Soviet people no longer believe that the party can remedy the difficult situation in the country.

The morning meeting adopted the proposal to submit on behalf of Russian communists a draft resolution to the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party condemning insults to the memory of the founder of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet state—V.I. Lenin.

The meeting also adopted an address to communists, people's deputies of the Russian Federation, calling on them to show political responsibility in voting for the decree on power. The draft decree is now being discussed by the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation. In the opinion of a number of speakers, the document contains provisions aimed at "demoralising the party," at "weakening communist influence on society and heightening political destabilisation in the country."

The debate will be continued in the afternoon.

Information Report Published on Party Conference

PM2006155390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 20 Jun 90 Single Edition p 1

["Russian Party Conference: Information Report"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] The Russian party conference started its work 19 June 1990 at 1000 hours in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow. It was opened by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau.

The delegates elected the leading organs of the conference: the Presidium, the Secretariat, and the Editorial and Credentials Commissions.

After a thorough exchange of opinions, the standing orders and the following agenda were ratified:

1. On the present situation and the creation of a Russian Federation Communist Party.

2. On the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress and the draft CPSU Statutes.

N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chaired the afternoon sitting. The participants in the conference heard M.S. Gorbachev's report "With Responsibility for the Future of Russia and the Whole Country."

The following then made supplementary reports: on behalf of the Russian Party Conference Preparatory Committee—I.P. Osadchii; on behalf of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU"—B.N. Lysenko; on behalf of the "Marxist Platform in the CPSU"—A.I. Kolganov; and on behalf of the Russian Communists' Initiative Congress—V.A. Tyulkin.

Participating in the debates on the questions under discussion were: V.I. Ladygin, a diesel locomotive engineer at the Transbaykal Railroad Ye.M. Yaroslavskiy Locomotive Depot in Chita; S.L. Serokurov, first secretary of Murmansk CPSU Obkom [Oblast Party Committee]; N.F. Suldaykin, secretary of the "Rezinotekhnika" plant party committee in Saransk, Mordovian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]; and T.I. Lyapakov, deputy director of the Ust-Kubinskiy High School in Vologda Oblast.

The discussion continued at the evening sitting.

The chairman was Yu.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and member of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau. Participating in the debates were: V.G. Golovachev, first secretary of Saratov CPSU Gorkom [City Party Committee] and chairman of the city soviet of people's deputies; B.V. Gidasov, first secretary of Leningrad CPSU Obkom; A.M. Makashov, commander of the Volga-Urals Military District; G.I. Sklyar, first secretary of Obninsk CPSU Gorkom, Kaluga Oblast; Ye.I. Yarkin, ship assembly team leader at the A.M. Gorkiy Plant in Zelenodolsk, Tatar ASSR; and A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of Kemerovo CPSU Obkom.

TASS Reviews 21 June People's Deputy Session

LD2106065990 Moscow TASS in English 0647 GMT
21 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow June 21 TASS—The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation draws to a close today. For five weeks, more than a thousand deputies representing the population of the Soviet Union's largest republic, have been discussing the socioeconomic development of the republic and ways to tackle the crisis that has gripped all spheres of social life.

At today's session, deputies are expected to discuss a number of important items, including news organisations in Russia, and the establishment of a supreme

economic council under the authority of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

Congress of People's Deputies Session Begins

LD2106100790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
0830 GMT 21 Jun 90

[Video report from the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies by correspondent Mikheyev, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The morning session began with deputies speaking on various themes. Then, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet presented the proposal to complete the work of the congress on Friday 22 June. [video shows delegates seated in hall, cuts to show Yeltsin presiding, and various deputies speaking from the rostrum]

Deputy Shakray was given the floor to present the draft of the provisional clause on the provision of deputies' activity of RSFSR People's Deputies. The question has a direct bearing on the problem of the transfer of power to the hands of the soviets, the speaker stressed. All our laws will remain on paper only if the people's deputies leave here without the possibility of really implementing power in the localities. The law on the status of USSR people's deputies was taken as the basis of the proposed draft. The written proposals of deputies were also used.

The deputies began to discuss the draft, which was then voted on. The draft was adopted by the majority of Votes. [video shows voting screen: 809 for, 23 against, two abstain, total 834]

Moscow TV Relays 20 June Congress Proceedings

Social Problems Viewed

LD2006120490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1100 GMT on 20 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the 20 June proceedings at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Yeltsin calls for salute of the RSFSR flag and says he hopes the congress might complete its work today.

At 1102 GMT an unidentified deputy laments the plight of the Karachay people who lost their autonomous status in 1943 after being decimated by war and the Stalinist period. He calls for their status and rights to be restored.

At 1108 GMT Yeltsin responds to the above by mentioning a commission which has been set up to look into the affairs of repressed peoples.

At 1109 GMT an unidentified deputy says the declaration adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet is insufficient to restore the rights of repressed peoples. He calls for a solution to the issue of refugees.

At 1111 GMT Deputy Belonogov from Amur Oblast suggests that "union diktat" is turning into "republican diktat" and calls for an increase in the powers of local soviets.

At 1114 GMT an unidentified deputy from Kabardino-Balkariya speaks about a meeting of mourning for his people who were displaced by the Crimean War; he criticizes as "libelous" a paper which was being distributed at the congress with regard to the Kabardino-Balkariya people.

At 1117 GMT Yeltsin warns of the need not to fan up any tension.

At 1119 GMT Deputy Konstantinov from Yaroslavl says that the congress dealt with agricultural issues too hastily. He asks for the congress' resolution to be voted on with a named ballot in today's session and material on it to be published in detail.

At 1122 GMT an unidentified deputy complains that discussion of bread price rises had been curtailed; he wants the congress to return to that issue.

At 1124 GMT an unidentified deputy calls for greater republican control over the KGB and interior ministry.

At 1125 GMT an unidentified deputy calls for the full rehabilitation of the Kalmyk people.

At 1126 GMT Yeltsin calls a vote on whether to return to the congress agenda. Decision adopted with 777 for; 40 against; eight abstentions. Attendance is registered: 821 are present. There is a quorum.

Elections Viewed

LD2006123190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 20 June continues its recorded relay of the 20 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Yeltsin says 10 more people remain to be elected to the Supreme Soviet.

At 1131 GMT Deputy (Akhmedkanov) says the issue is in a stalemate. He warns that if the matter is not resolved at the congress it might overflow with "unpredictable consequences" into the streets of towns and villages. He blames a minority from Moscow and Leningrad for the situation. The Supreme Soviet must not be left without delegates from those cities, he says.

At 1135 GMT Yeltsin asks for candidatures to be submitted from the areas which have so far not done so.

At 1136 GMT a deputy from Leningrad offers to explain the situation in that city. Deputies from that city approved their candidates for the Supreme Soviet but differences between them brought about a breakdown of this deal.

At 1137 GMT Deputy Filatov from Moscow speaks. .

At 1141 GMT Deputy Ostrenkov from Kalinin Oblast explains why his area was unable to submit a candidature.

At 1144 GMT a Leningrad deputy says that attempts were made to reach a compromise in his camp but these had broken down.

At 1145 GMT a Kemerovo deputy says his camp has sorted out its differences. Yeltsin praises this "constructive approach."

At 1146 GMT Yeltsin appeals to the Leningraders: Can you sort out your own problems or must the congress do it for you?

At 1147 GMT a deputy from Kalinin Oblast speaks in favor of a candidate. He asks the congress to decide in favor of the rival candidates.

At 1149 GMT a deputy rejects Yeltsin's description of the Leningraders' approach as "unconstructive." He praises two candidates—Dmitriyev and Tolstoy. Yeltsin says he had not made reproaches, but appeals. Yeltsin goes on to read the list of candidates. It is decided by a vote that the congress should elect the remaining Supreme Soviet members. Yeltsin explains the procedure for the election. Various deputies criticize the system. A vote is taken on whether to use the proposed system. It is adopted; 682 for; 218 against; nine abstentions.

At 1205 GMT the congress proceeds to vote on each candidate by secret ballot.

Elections Continue

LD2006131390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1215 GMT on 20 June continues its recorded relay of the 20 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Voting continues, candidate by candidate, for their respective areas.

At 1230 GMT an unidentified deputy casts doubt on the accuracy of the electronic votes, and an official confirms that the machine is not showing the correct results. The correct ones will be in the protocol. But it has made no difference to the outcome. A deputy proposes going back to voting by slips. Yeltsin proposes that this should be done for those candidates remaining where there are more candidates than posts. Secret voting continues for the Moscow candidates since there are two for two seats. Both are elected.

At 1241 GMT Yeltsin asks the counting commission to set to work. Yeltsin asks for Leningrad, Kostroma, and Kalinin delegates to select their candidates so that there will not be more candidates than seats so that they can be elected by secret ballot.

At 1242 GMT a Kalinin delegate says it is very hard to choose and they are embarrassed at the confusion. He puts forward a priest, who is neither right nor left. Yeltsin invites other proposals from deputies from these areas. One Kalinin candidate steps down; another delegate insists on the need for a progressive candidate from Kalinin. At 1245 GMT a Kostroma delegate proposes that the candidate with the most votes should stand. Another says they will try again during the break to find a candidate, but their delegation, small as it is, is split down the middle.

At 1248 GMT no one from Leningrad seems willing to speak on the issue. They will have to put their candidate forward after the break.

At 1249 GMT an unidentified delegate addresses congress on the autonomy decree, and the need to adopt a law on citizenship. Then he speaks on refugees, many of who are living in the European part of the RSFSR, many of whom are the weakest members of society. There is also a problem of people moving to other areas: Russians who have moved to Central Asia, for example, wonder about returning given the sharpening of ethnic feelings. He calls for the Supreme Soviet to work on the draft on this subject. He calls for a commission on refugees and settlers to be set up, in spite of the fact that this was not passed yesterday. The congress should return to this question, he says.

At 1254 GMT Yeltsin says the list of commissions will be given out today.

At 1255 GMT Deputy (Smolskiy) speaks about the dangers of voting by name, because people get labels hung on them arbitrarily. He quotes his own specific case.

At 1257 GMT Yeltsin agrees that voting by name should be used very rarely, only for questions of deep principle. He then declares a 30-minute break.

Candidates Address Congress

LD2006135690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1259 GMT on 20 June continues its recorded relay of the 20 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

After the break, the congress returns to voting on the unresolved candidacies. Kostroma, and Leningrad report back on their decisions over the break on which candidates they now wish to submit. This leaves only Kalinin with alternatives.

At 1302 GMT Kalinin candidate Bragin addresses the congress. He says he is not supported by the party apparatus. He outlines his all-round knowledge and experience.

At 1303 GMT Yeltsin runs through the candidates for all three constituencies again. Voting takes place again on the procedure to be followed.

At 1307 GMT Kalinin candidate Zlobin addresses the congress. He does not belong to a party, but is standing because he loves Russia. His appeal for confidence gets applause.

At 1308 GMT an unidentified delegate returns to the confusion with electronic voting, saying that since it misled the delegates, their mistaken conceptions influence their subsequent votes. Yeltsin suggests that the results not be shown on the screen at all. This suggestion is accepted.

At 1310 GMT voting starts.

At 1316 GMT Yeltsin calls on the counting commission to get to work. He then talks about the proposals put to the editorial commission, and calls on deputy (Semenov) to talk about this. In fact Tolstoy comes to the rostrum.

At 1318 GMT, Tolstoy talks about the alternatives that are put forward on the subjects under discussion, and explains the technicalities of the editorial commission's work, and problems that have arisen connected with it, specifically the issue of sovereignty.

At 1322 GMT, deputies start debating the issues raised by Tolstoy.

Decree on Authority Viewed

LD2006141790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1327 GMT on 20 June continues its recorded relay of the 20 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy (Barybin) says that the declaration on sovereignty requires further revision and should then be brought before the next congress for discussion.

At 1330 GMT Deputy Tolstoy explains that the declaration is a basis for discussion.

At 1331 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether to discuss this issue for one hour. Decision is adopted: 572 for; 272 against; 16 abstentions.

At 1332 GMT Deputy Markov says a decree on authority should be submitted for discussion.

At 1333 GMT a Leningrad deputy says the document is poorly prepared, but the issue should be discussed today.

At 1334 GMT a Novosibirsk deputy proposes that deputies should be protected during the congress from outside influences, claiming that yesterday approaches had been made by delegates to the Russian party conference.

At 1336 GMT Deputy (Petukhov) argues against the "fashionable" tendency to call for the localization of

KGB and interior ministry organs; he says these are all-Union bodies which need to be controlled from the centre.

At 1345 GMT an unidentified deputy says that the decree on authority "is in many respects contrary to the Constitution of the USSR"; it does not provide due status to the soviets.

At 1347 GMT Deputy Mironov from Zelenograd speaks of the need to wrest power from the body which took it 72 years ago. Until we have done this we do not have the right to leave this hall. This should be done by approving the decree on authority.

At 1349 GMT Deputy Kalashnikov from Ryazan Oblast supports the proposal that the issue should be removed from the agenda of this congress. The congress would be infringing its own areas of competence by adopting a decision which, for example, restricted the authority of the KGB and the Interior Ministry.

At 1350 GMT an unidentified deputy, speaking on behalf of agrarian deputies, says the decree "violates human rights" and is not properly prepared; it should be withdrawn.

At 1351 GMT Deputy Gerasimov from Kurgan asks his colleagues to consider soberly what they are doing. Everything should be thoroughly worked through by commissions and resubmitted at the next congress.

At 1352 GMT a Nakhodka deputy says that if the decree on authority is adopted, Russia would find itself in the position of a soldier with one boot. The congress also bears a responsibility for the whole Union, not just the republic.

Debates Continue

LD2006145390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1355 GMT on 20 June continues its recorded relay at the 20 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1355 GMT an unidentified deputy calls for wisdom and balanced thinking on the part of deputies in discussing this matter because it is a long-term thing and needs to be properly thought-out.

At 1358 GMT Yeltsin says there has been a proposal to end the debate now and asks deputies to vote on this. It is agreed, but the result is not shown.

At 1400 GMT Yeltsin reads out three of proposals from various quarters as to how to proceed and calls for them to be voted on.

At 1404 GMT an independent deputy speaks about the proposal to transfer the question of the decree on power to the next party congress.

At 1407 GMT another deputy proposes that article-by-article discussion start after the lunch interval and by the end of the day a single document on a decree on power should be adopted.

At 1408 GMT a deputy from Kislovodsk proposes that the question be voted on by name and the results be published in full in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

At 1410 GMT Deputy Varov from Leningrad says this is not "Varov's draft" as some people are saying but a "draft of the people."

At 1412 GMT a deputy from the hall slates the "anti-people's party" for trying to influence the hall and calls for voting on the draft article-by-article.

At 1413 GMT a deputy from Magnitogorsk asks for the two proposals to be put to the vote. He calls for "deputies' ethics" to be observed here.

At 1414 GMT Yeltsin says the main thing is for deputies to work together and not to have confrontation.

At 1416 GMT Deputy Belkin says this question was not on the agenda of the congress and proposes that the document be passed on to the party congress.

At 1417 GMT Deputy Velchik from Kuybyshev says the main task is to secure the separation of the party from the state.

At 1418 GMT Deputy Gritsenko holds up a copy of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA which carries a proposal he made but which he says was not put to the vote.

At 1421 GMT Deputy Zadonskiy says the party conference is discussing the same question. A stenographic account of the discussions should be passed on to the congress.

At 1423 GMT a uniformed deputy says the document makes no reference to a Union treaty or questions of the economy and ownership and calls for it to be passed on to the congress. This is voted on. It is passed by 822 votes to 60, with three abstentions.

At 1428 GMT there is a round of applause as an unidentified lady enters the hall. She is then introduced by Yeltsin as a new people's deputy of the USSR.

At 1430 GMT Yeltsin calls for voting by name that the Supreme Soviet Editorial Commission should put the finishing touches to the document and present it to the next party congress. The voting is 550 for, 380 against, and 17 abstentions.

At 1433 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether to continue discussion of the document today taking into consideration each amendment. The voting is 409 for, 482 against, and 38 abstentions.

At 1435 GMT Yeltsin reads out a decision of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies on the mechanism of people's power of the RSFSR and itemizes it point by

point. He puts this draft decision to the vote by name. The result is 490 in favor, 368 against, and 48 abstentions, so the draft is not adopted.

At 1439 GMT Deputy (Nemtsov) calls for article-by-article voting on the draft.

More on Decree of Power

LD2006164290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1440 GMT on 20 June continues its recorded relay of the 20 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow. Yeltsin announces the opening of the evening session, and passes the floor to Sidorenko, chairman of the tellers commission.

At 1442 GMT Sidorenko reads out two protocols on the results of electronic voting in the election of deputies to the Soviet of the Republic in various regions. Five deputies have been elected out of nine regions. The results of the voting for the Soviet of Nationalities will be announced at the next session. Yeltsin calls for a vote on the endorsement of the report of the tellers commission. The voting is: 781 for, 25 against, and two abstentions. The decision is adopted. Yeltsin proposes a round of applause for Sidorenko and his commission. Thank you, says Sidorenko, on behalf of his colleagues.

At 1451 GMT Yeltsin proposes that the congress embark on an article-by-article discussion of the draft law on power. He says that some deputies do not have the document in front of them.

At 1500 GMT various deputies take the floor and voice their opinion on the merits of shortcomings of the draft decree on power.

At 1501 GMT Yeltsin calls for voting by name and asks the computer group not to make a mistake. Yeltsin reminds deputies that the draft decree is not being revoked. The decision was not adopted: 522 for, and 253 against.

At 1502 GMT various deputies take the floor. An unidentified deputy warns that a crisis situation is being created, and supports the "reasonable" idea put forward by Yeltsin on a compromise decision.

At 1505 GMT Yeltsin says that a member of the computing group has explained that that decision has in fact been adopted, as it requires a simple majority only.

At 1508 GMT various deputies take the floor and voice their views on the decree on power.

At 1511 GMT a deputy praises the way Yeltsin has brought discussions "out of a dead-end" and proposes the compromise version proposed by Yeltsin.

At 1514 GMT deputies continue to speak on the decree on authority and on the proceedings so far.

At 1517 GMT Yeltsin warns deputies to observe the procedure and to take their seats.

At 1518 GMT a deputy speaks in favor of adopting a compromise version, as proposed by Yeltsin, with slight amendments.

At 1519 GMT various deputies take the floor. Deputy (?Kibirov) asks where the main document is, and if what they are discussing is the alternative. Yeltsin reminds him that the main document was presented earlier in the proceedings.

At 1523 GMT a deputy speaks from the rostrum on the need for adopting a decision today on the decree on power. He refers to points of the document which he says do not exist in the Constitution, or which contradict the Constitution.

At 1525 GMT a deputy accuses Volkogonov and other Army generals of "not being sincere" when they say the decree on power should not be adopted, and says that everyone knows that only party people in the Army rise to the rank of general.

At 1527 GMT Yeltsin calls for voting on whether to end the debate. The decision is adopted: 716 for, 103 against, and six abstain; 825 total. Yeltsin then allows a female deputy to speak "by way of exception." She calls for the congress to vote for the adoption of a decision, as Yeltsin suggested. Another deputy comes to the rostrum "by way of exception," and says that deputies had the draft since the morning. He goes on to talk of various points, and is heckled by deputies in the hall.

At 1532 GMT Yeltsin asks the deputies to take their seats, to be calm "and to find a solution that will satisfy us and the people of Russia." Yeltsin calls for attention. He says he will wait. He says they are faced with a dilemma: to adopt the decision or to send it back for more work. He stresses the "great significance" of the point on the unacceptability of holding two posts.

At 1535 GMT Yeltsin calls for voting by name on adopting the decision as the basis: 653 are for, 194 are against, and 31 abstain; the decision is adopted. Yeltsin now invites deputies to take the floor and talk on the decision point by point.

At 1538 GMT deputies take the floor and begin to suggest amendments to the preamble.

At 1539 GMT Yeltsin asks who is in favor of adopting the second amendment. There is no need to vote on the first, he says.

At 1540 GMT deputies vote on the preamble. There are 818 for, 28 against, and 14 abstain; the preamble is adopted.

Amendments Debated

LD2006185190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1541 GMT on 20 June continues its recorded relay of the 20 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow. Various deputies take the floor and speak on point one. Yeltsin says the amendment on whether the post "is paid" should be voted on, and calls for deputies to vote on that amendment. Deputy Tikhonov takes the floor and says it is wrong to vote on that.

At 1543 GMT Yeltsin again calls for voting on the amendment regarding payment. Yeltsin says that if we do not finish today, we will finish tomorrow; 320 are for; the decision is adopted.

At 1545 GMT another deputy takes the floor. Yeltsin says let's stick to the point. He calls for the deputies to be calm, and asks for the amendment to be "sped up." A deputy hands him the amendment regarding "cooperative organizations." He reads out the amendment and puts it up for voting. Deputies take the floor and speak on the amendment.

At 1550 GMT Deputy Ryumin says that party and labor posts should not be combined. Deputy Ryumin agrees with this, and calls for it to be put to the vote.

At 1612 GMT the recording relay resumes with the continuation of the evening session. Debates on amendments to the wording of the first point continue, and a vote on them is taken. Deputies vote on the proposal that party and other posts should not be combined: It is carried by 533 votes to 302, with 36 abstentions.

At 1620 GMT deputies vote on the proposal that state and political posts should not be combined: It is carried by 692 votes to 111, with 31 abstentions.

At 1621 GMT deputies vote on whether debates on the first point should be concluded: It is carried by 779 votes to 33, with three abstentions.

At 1623 GMT deputies vote on the proposal that in the RSFSR, the offices of the leaders of state bodies should not be combined with political and other posts: It is carried by 804 votes to 55, with 23 abstentions.

At 1625 GMT Yeltsin asks if there are any amendments to Article 2. Voting is carried out on the wording of this article, and it is not adopted. Deputies make various proposals regarding the functions of law-enforcement bodies, and their insertion into the section of the article. The amendment is not adopted.

At 1632 GMT deputies refer back to the preamble, and its correlation to Article 2 on rights of citizens.

At 1634 GMT Yeltsin proposes that voting be carried out on Article 2 as a whole. The results of the vote are: 475 for, 417 against, and 31 abstentions: it is not adopted.

At 1635 GMT the vote on Article 3 is taken: 462 for, 378 against, and one abstention. It is not adopted.

At 1637 GMT there is some confusion over whether the article can be adopted before or after the amendments, so Yeltsin refers back to standing orders.

At 1638 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on Article 4, then realizes that the congress has already adopted it. So he moves on to amendments to this article.

At 1640 GMT Yeltsin refers to Article 29, which stipulates how voting should be carried out. A deputy reads from this article, then makes a further verbal point to Yeltsin on the matter.

At 1643 GMT an unidentified deputy wants to know why the decree on power has not been adopted. There is commotion in the hall as the deputy is rebuked by Yeltsin for his remarks about the party apparatus.

At 1645 GMT Deputy Tikhomirov, the commentator, makes a procedural point.

At 1646 GMT Yeltsin goes back to the question of amendments to Article 4. He says that unless deputies stick to the point he will have their microphones switched off. A deputy wants Articles 2 and 3 annulled, but finds he is cut short as the microphone is switched off.

At 1653 GMT, after some criticism from a deputy about the voting system, Yeltsin gets down to voting on amendments to the Article.

At 1657 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on the RSFSR congress decision on the mechanism of people's power. It is carried by 820 votes to 32, with 15 abstentions. He says there are still a number of proposals, but time is running out. He wants to put to the vote whether to continue the agenda: it is rejected. The congress will continue tomorrow at 1000.

Deputies Congress Forms Supreme Soviet

*LD2006181490 Moscow TASS in English 1718 GMT
20 Jun 90*

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The First Congress of Deputies of the Russian Federation today completed the formation of the republic's standing legislature, the Supreme Soviet.

The last nine vacancies in the Council of the Republic, one of the parliament's two houses, were filled in additional elections. A total of 251 parliamentarians have been elected.

Only one seat remains vacant in the Council of Nationalities allocated to Siberia's Kemerovo region. At the request of the regional deputation, the vote will be held at the Second Congress.

After the congress decided this morning to assign the Supreme Soviet and the Constitutional Commission work to finish drafting the decree on authority and submit it for consideration to the next congress, a group of lawyers-deputies presented an alternative document—a draft resolution on people's authority.

This draft proposes a mechanism for exercising people's authority in the Russian Federation.

The debate on the procedure of discussing the draft was stormy, with long lines of deputies waiting to speak near microphones.

The resolution proclaims that "in keeping with the Russian Constitution and the declaration on sovereignty, all power in the Russian Federation belongs to the people" who "exercise state authority through soviets of people's deputies and through forms of direct democracy".

To guarantee the equality of citizens, the draft stipulates that the republic "does not allow the head of a state body of authority or management to hold another position, including in political or socio-political organisations".

Not all articles in the draft gained the support of deputies. One of these was the provision that "judges, public prosecutors and officials of the Russian Federation's law enforcement bodies suspend their membership in parties and socio-political organisations throughout their tenure".

The majority of deputies also rejected the article providing for the congress to propose that the USSR's top bodies of state authority eliminate bodies of party-political management within the Soviet Armed Forces.

The resolution was adopted by the majority of votes after an article-by-article discussion.

The congress, due to close today, will continue its work on Thursday in keeping with the agenda.

Yeltsin Criticized in Report From Congress

LD2006155390

[Editorial report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1030 GMT on 20 June broadcasts a 10-minute report by radio correspondent Andrey Nikiforov in which after rounding up this morning's proceedings at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies, he interviews RSFSR People's Deputy Vladimir Konstantinovich Varov, secretary of the All-Russian Council of Independent Trade Unions and associations, one of the co-authors of the draft decree on power. Varov speaks of the critical situation that has taken shape at the congress, the opposition to the decree by the communists who make up more than 80 percent of those present, and the attempts to stop power being handed over to the local soviets, as well as their opposition to the issue of sovereignty. Varov rebuts the claim that the draft decree has not been

sufficiently worked up and states that he thinks a real split occurred at the congress.

Deputy Vladimir Mikhaylovich Kuznetsov from Moscow then tells Nikiforov that "as a member of the CPSU he voted against it. It is a decision of the party apparatus which has brought the country to despair." This deputy is leaving the CPSU in protest against the congress decision and in protest against the fact that the congress has been embraced by the party conference. He says that the party conference brought pressure to bear on the congress' decision. "Another thing that troubles me is that Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin] is going further and further to the right, step by step, in my opinion. I have already criticized him in your broadcasts and I am doing so now. I simply appeal to Boris Nikolayevich to think about this issue."

Nikiforov reports that no official statement has been made by the party conference regarding the congress and says that one should make some allowances for Yeltsin as he will have to come to some compromises.

Leningrad Committee Adopts Appeal for Lithuania

LD1806210790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian
1920 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] The Leningrad Lithuania Support Committee has adopted an appeal to the peoples of the world that reads, I quote: The authorities in the Kremlin explain their actions by saying that allegedly, Vilnius has no desire to come to the negotiation table with Moscow. This is not true; there is a desire. The matter is, that constructively, the pressure is coming from above. Negotiations between our countries are possible only on an equal footing. The world public opinion is one of the forces which can lead the situation out of the deadlock, influence the policy of Moscow, and help achieve a solution to the conflict without violence.

We call upon everyone who supports the Lithuanian people's aspiration for independence, upon those who take a critical attitude toward the official version of Soviet-Lithuanian relations proposed by the Kremlin, which are beneficial to the Kremlin. We call upon all independently thinking people to form committees of support for Lithuania with the future aim of setting up an international association. The voice of such an association will be heard sooner than the individual scattered voices of those who share the legitimate aspiration of the people of the republic of Lithuania for full and unconditional freedom. Without solidarity there is no freedom, end of quotation.

Western Republics

Ukraine Parliament Argues Over State Symbols

PM2305110790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 May 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov: "Second Week of Debates"]

[Text] Kiev—The beginning of the second week of parliamentary debates at the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session did not presage any difficulties. But again, just like last week, the semblance of agreement proved deceptive. It only took the Ukrainian SSR people's deputies from Lugansk Oblast to come forward with a statement proposing that the Ukrainian SSR state flag be set up in the hall for the outwardly peaceful mood to change into open confrontation.

Representatives of the "democratic bloc," seizing the microphones, endeavored to impress the deputies with their arguments. Such as: that the Ukraine's current state symbol was foisted on the republic by Stalin, and that under the red banner the Ukrainian people had been subjected to unbelievable repressions. The "democratic bloc" group of deputies walked out of the hall at the beck of their leader. And speculation as to the cause of the anger and the cynicism of the orators who abused the Lugansk deputies who put forward the proposal and all who supported it might have gone on for a long time had it not been for the revelations of Deputy L. Lukyanenko who had seized the microphone. He declared: we are deputies of a transitional parliament and it will not yet be able to put up either the red flag or the yellow and blue flag in the hall. Therefore a compromise was possible—to raise both banners and to set up the Ukrainian SSR state crest....

"Let us uphold the Ukrainian SSR Constitution," the sensible deputies urged. "After all, no one has repealed it!" "Let us listen to the voice of the people," the representatives of many deputies' groups said, developing this logical train of thought. "The voters are demanding that we finally get down to business."

This is the position of the majority of the Ukrainian SSR people's deputies. They express the will of their electorate. The division of votes on the question under discussion is also characteristic: 302 deputies voted in favor of the Lugansk deputies' proposal, 5 voted against, and 11 abstained.

The incident in the hall spilled over, as indeed the "democratic bloc" speakers prophesied, into the hysteria of a few dozen supporters of the yellow-and-blue emblem on constant duty in the square in front of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet building.

And the perplexed questions resound increasingly loudly: why is support being demonstrated so one-sidedly? After all, there are more voters on the other wing. The nearby "Arsenal" plant, justly called a bastion of support for the proletarian revolution, on its own could have shown this support on a much larger scale. And the yellow-and-azure flags would have dissolved into a sea of red calico banners. This picture would have been much closer to the real disposition of forces in the Ukraine.

However, the infinite patience of the majority eventually allowed a return to discussion of the provisional

standing orders, and before the lunch recess the session had adopted the first seven articles.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Session Continues

PM2805105590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov: "Press to Blame Again?"]

[Text] Kiev, 25 May—This morning the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet session unanimously adopted a decision to consider this year, 1990, the year for the recovery of the children living on the territory which suffered from the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station and to take additional steps in this connection.

For the second day running the deputies are discussing the report of V. Masol, chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers. There are constructive proposals, but there is also plenty of keen and sharp criticism directed against the USSR and Ukrainian SSR governments. The press was also a target. One speaker noted that the central newspapers write nothing about the sittings of the Ukrainian socialist parliament. Actually, those charges cannot be leveled against PRAVDA. That is borne out by yesterday's speech by People's Deputy V. Yavorivskiy.

It was like this. The day before yesterday, workers from the nearby "Arsenal" plant—named for V.I. Lenin—after their shift came to the building of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet where people usually stand with yellow and blue flags. The demonstrators carried red flags and posters calling for the unity of our country's republics. There were people who did not like that. And a blatantly provocative note about how there were drunkards among the "Arsenal" workers was passed to the hall of sessions and was read out by V. Yavorivskiy.

This was seen and heard by millions of television viewers in the "Topical Camera" program. They also saw a people's deputy walking among the "Arsenal" workers checking who was sober and who was drunk....

And yesterday he was obliged to admit that there were no drunkards among the "Arsenal" workers. But he found another enemy: he said it was PRAVDA which through one of its items organized the workers' procession to the Supreme Soviet, which could have unfavorable consequences.

Deputy Yavorivskiy has a strange logic—the people with yellow and blue flags, who once literally laid siege to the Supreme Soviet building, cannot "generate consequences" but the "Arsenal" workers can. And it is even stranger that all this was attributed to the press, as was usually done quite recently, in the times of stagnation.

Ukraine Supreme Soviet Session Discusses Issues

LD2905100990 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1810 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] Kiev, 28 May (UKRINFORM-TASS)—The session of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet which is taking place here has completed discussion of the report on the political, socioeconomic and ecological situation of the Ukraine which was delivered by Vitaliy Masol, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers.

Both similar and diametrically opposed views were expressed. The activity of the Ukraine SSR Government was subjected to exacting evaluation, and the USSR Council of Ministers and all-Union ministries and departments were criticized in principle. Proposals were made to improve the political, socioeconomic and ecological situation in the Ukraine.

The addresses paid a great deal of attention to matters concerning the republic's transition to regional financial autonomy and self-financing and its assertion of political and economic sovereignty as well as the introduction of a market economy.

The Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet adopted a decision in connection with the introduction by the USSR Government of a concept for the transition to a regulated market economy and raising state retail prices. It says in particular that the transition to a regulated market economy is an objective and natural process. At the same time the decision stresses that it is impermissible to adopt any decisions on issues of raising state retail prices without reliable compensation machinery for the social protection of the population and without agreements with the Union republics.

The Ukraine SSR Council of Ministers was instructed to prepare a package of the necessary draft laws and normative acts and present it for examination by the next session of the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet. These bills and acts should regulate conditions and procedure for the republic's transition to a regulated market economy and envisage reliable social protection for its citizens.

It was decided to bring the decision to the attention of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Nominations were put forward for the post of chairman of the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet.

Ukrainian Parliament Endorses Market Economy

LD2805182290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] A decision was adopted today at the session of Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet in relation to the concept of transition to a regulated market economy, proposed to [as heard] the USSR Government. Acknowledging the objective necessity of such a transition the republican Supreme Soviet

believes that there is a need for preliminary discussion of this concept by the parliaments of all union republics. The government of the Ukrainian Republic was instructed to prepare a package of bills and law-making acts on the transition of the Ukraine to a regulated market economy. Today, elections of the chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet began. Eleven candidates have been put forward for this post.

'Chernobyl' Union Congress Ends in Kiev

PM2006152190 Moscow KRA SNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 19 Jun 90 First Edition p 4

[Dispatch by correspondent Colonel A. Polyakov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Our Common Pain—The First 'Chernobyl' Union Congress Ends Its Work In Kiev"]

[Text] Kiev—Emotions have been boiling over for three days running in the Political Enlightenment House where the congress took place. Delegates called for unity and heatedly argued that they were all equal, but when it came to the election of various commissions they tried at all costs to nominate their own region's representative. All the same, they came together on the main point—Chernobyl is our common pain.

The congress delegates spoke of the need to increase social protection for all who took part in the elimination of the consequences of the accident and for people living in the contaminated territory; to improve medical services for them; to determine more quickly and more expertly the effect of small doses of radiation on man; and to determine the legal status of those who were burned by the invisible fire.

There were 35 military delegates taking part in the work of the congress. It was decided to form a military section within the structure of the "Chernobyl" union. Many believe that military servicemen have again ended up being the least socially protected group. It was pointed out that the Ministry of Defense and the Central Military Medical Directorate have been slow in providing all-around support for officers and soldiers.

Lieutenant Colonel, Retired, B. Shuklin, a delegate at the congress and former military helicopter pilot who took part in the elimination of the accident, spent a total of 78 days in the contaminated area and received a total irradiation dose equal to that of 42 X-rays. He unexpectedly fell seriously ill in late 1986, ending up more than once in hospital, but only after four years did physicians reach the conclusion that the illness was linked with Chernobyl.

"We believe that an organ should be set up under the General Staff to study the problems of Chernobyl soldiers and military garrisons stationed in or near the contaminated areas," Lieutenant Colonel V. Grishin, a member of the union's Executive Committee Bureau, said. "Military legislation on benefits, which is now manifestly out of date, needs to be brought into line with

civilian legislation, and a group for collaboration with the union needs to be set up in the military and the USSR Supreme Soviet."

V. Shovkoshitnyy, Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputy, member of the recently created Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Commission on Chernobyl, and an active participant in the elimination of the consequences of the accident, was elected president of the "Chernobyl" union.

A telegram was sent on the congress' behalf to USSR President M.S. Gorbachev proposing that internal troops subunits posted to guard the power station be withdrawn from Chernobyl and replaced with volunteers.

Dnepropetrovsk Prison Riot 'Under Control'

PM2006105890 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent N. Mironov under the rubric "Following an Event": "Still Worrying"]

[Text] Dnepropetrovsk, 18 Jun—The disturbances at the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee Internal Affairs Administration No. 1 Remand Prison are in their fifth day. Let me remind you that on Thursday night a group of prisoners broke down the doors of several cells, took hostages, and opened the other cells in the prison. Some 2,000 prisoners went on the rampage through the internal premises and set fire to part of the buildings in the medical unit and pharmacy. Drug addicts swallowed large quantities of drugs, as a result of which several people died. Two prisoners were killed while trying to leave the territory.

Internal troops, arriving on the scene, blockaded the prison's external fence. As a result of the measures adopted, none of those in detention has left the prison limits. The situation is under control.

Those in the prison have made a series of demands for improvements in domestic and sanitary conditions, a softening of the regime, and legal defense. Talks are in progress. After 24 hours the hostages were released. The evacuation of prisoners to other prisons in the republic has begun.

However, not everyone is agreeing to leave the ruined premises voluntarily. The situation remains very tense.

Criminal proceedings have been instituted. The oblast prosecutor's office is investigating the incident.

Ukraine's Ivashko Speaks at Party Congress

LD2006203590 Kiev International Service in English
2300 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Vladimir Ivashko at the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress on 19 June in

Kiev; presented by commentator Serge Grinyuk—recorded; Ivashko speaks in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation]

[Excerpts] [Grinyuk] Hello, and welcome to "Ukraine Today." Tonight's program is on the 28th Ukraine Communist Party Congress, which began its work today in Kiev. [passage omitted]

[Ivashko] The 28th Ukraine Communist Party Congress, which convened after the expiration of the term of powers of the Central Committee, elected at the previous congress, is an extraordinary one. Bringing closer the terms of the congress reflects the concern of communists, broad masses of the working people, over the situation within the party and in the country over the aggravation of the socio-political situation. Five years ago, the party began a radical restructuring of our society. This line, worked out by the April 1985 plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, by the 27th congress of the party and the 19th all-Union party conference, was firmly supported by the people, because life turned out to be much more complicated and contradictory than it seemed to be. Hopes for immediate progress did not come true. The congress is called upon to give a thorough analysis of the political situation, positive and negative tendencies, to make a principled evaluation of everything attained and to outline a course for the future. We must sum up the results of the discussion by the Communist Party of the Ukraine of the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee to its congress and of the new party rules. We must also examine and adopt programmed principles of the activities of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, as well as documents which reflect our understanding of the sovereignty of the Communist Party of the Ukraine within the Soviet Communist Party, and which would outline its rights and duties. And finally, the congress must form a new composition of the leading bodies of the Communist Party of the Ukraine.

Rapid and profound changes are taking place in all spheres of life of the society. A political reform is under way. A turn for a real democracy became the first really democratic election of the people's deputies of the USSR, of the Ukraine's and local soviets. New bodies of power were created at all levels. New steps on the road of a radical economic reform are being made. Dynamic transformations are taking place in the spiritual life of the society. However, along the road of renovation, we come across numerous obstacles and problems, various conflicts and contradictions appear which previously were silenced. The living conditions of the people have worsened; people lose their certainty in tomorrow. It is difficult to explain to them why (?aid plans) and deficit of goods are growing. The ecological situation, especially after the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant, is aggravating and becoming critical.

Interethnic and religious intolerance is being artificially fanned. So, it is necessary to be very attentive in analyzing the changes in the sentiments of the people, in social consciousness, in analyzing the placing of political

forces and developments in the country. It is necessary to foresee the complications which can slow down or even curtail the democratization process. Without this, it is impossible to work out and implement a scientifically-grounded policy, which would correspond both to the current needs and strategic goals, to the vital interests of the people. [passage omitted on further impressions by individual delegates]

Report on Ukrainian Communist Party Congress

LD2006232390 Kiev International Service in English
2000 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Today is the second working day of the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party which is taking place here in Kiev. The congress worked today according to the agenda. The delegates of the congress started from discussion of the appeal of the Communist Party of the Ukraine about the political situation and the main directions of the activities of the Communist Party in the current moment.

The first speaking on this issue was the leader of the regional party organization of the Zaporozhye region, Grigoriy Kharchenko. Speaking critically about the role of the party nowadays he expressed some thoughts about the future of the Communist Party. In part he said:

[Kharchenko in vernacular fading into English translation] The situation in which the congress is taking place is understood for all. It cannot delight anybody but enemies of the party. Looking (?for) 28th Congress of the CPSU everybody asks themselves whether the ideological and organizational split of the party is possible, whether it will be divided into regional, national [word indistinct]. In many ways it depends on the 3 million detachment of the Ukrainian Communists. All of us who were inspired during election campaign by Communists to renew the party [words indistinct]. [end recording]

This is hard times for Communists now. They are blamed (?in many sins), but we can hardly blame them in (?faults) of economical policy of our government, inflation process, social tensions. But it was mentioned in many speeches at the congress the party is not dividing its [word indistinct] of this complicated situation. The first secretary of the Poltava regional party committee, a delegate, Aleksey Yekuta said:

[Yekuta in vernacular fading into English translation] Really there is no any other force but the Communist Party of the Soviet Union able to guide the nation out from the crisis. But there is a certain concern among helpful forces of our society. On the eve of the congress the regional party committee received a number of letters from communists and nonparty members anxious about the current situation in the party. They write that Politburo of the Central Committee, and especially the General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev, disregard the fate of the party. People are becoming suspicious not only to party bureaucrats but to ordinary communists as well. We

delegates must understand it well and (?through) our responsibility by our deeds to stop destruction of the party. The communists of the Poltava region greatly rely on the renewed Communist Party of the Ukraine with its new program and status within the framework of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They place their hope on independent Ukraine as a part of the Soviet Union, said Aleksey Yakuta. [passage omitted]

The leader of the Communist Party's organization of Donetsk region, Yevghen Mironov, urged that Communists pay greater attention to ideological works and consolidation of progressive forces within the party. The main task in his opinion is to catch up with fast changes taking place both in the party and the republic. That opinion was shared by Secretary of the Central Committee of the Ukrainian Communist Party, Leonid Kravchuk, who gave his interview for Radio Kiev. In part he said:

[Kravchuk in vernacular fading into English translation] Everybody says that we need a strong and consolidated Communist Party, said Leonid Kravchuk. Yet when efforts are being made to consolidate the party you don't see many people who would like to do it. They start searching for other ways and where do they find them? Either on the democratic platform although I don't say its not needed whereas some of its provisions are reasonable. Others quit the party in a show of (?manner) to the accompaniment of the slogans in which you believe and with which you try to wage a political struggle and hope to win. They say that the party is protected by the constitution, by the law. To wage a struggle what does it mean? Does it mean to act by instruction from above? If you do as they say on top of the pyramid then you are a good worker. Now the situation has changed and the Communist Party has been equalized with other political institutions. It had to wage a political struggle. So, we need to protect it and make sacrifices in struggle.

And now here is the opinion of Vladimir Vlazoon, a district leader of the Communist Party in Chernobyl region. In part he said the following: I think we should work out a strong economic policy in the party. We should not forget that man's consciousness is being determined by his material pattern. If we can change the country's economic situation for the better we shall be able to deal more easily with ideological problems. It seems to me that things are even more complicated on this plane now that Communists should work in the conditions of a multiparty. [passage omitted]

At the end of the plenary sitting the delegates discussed propositions submitted in relation with the formation of the leading bodies of the Communist Party of the Ukraine. And it is necessary to add that these proposals were controversial enough. Some delegates adopted them, others considered them antidemocratic and non-corresponding to the presentday situation and demands of the rank and file Communists. Finally, all of these propositions, as it was decided, were passed to a special commission. Konstantin Sytnik, member of the Central

Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, is answering our questions concerning this point:

[Sytnik in vernacular fading into English translation] It is very difficult for us members of the Central Committee to report at the congress because the majority of my colleagues [words indistinct] stand on conservative and nonprogressive positions, which doesn't have to do anything with perestroika. And this is why we feel that there are not so many people who would say that we have some positive results of our activities. I think that now, at the congress, the delegates are more radical and resolute. But we are not many, so far. New people have to be elected to the Central Committee and I would like to see in their eyes more optimism and belief in themselves. I also would like that these people would clearly see the future. I believe that the perspective is good although life is not easy today.

Controversial opinions were expressed today at the congress by members of the democratic bloc in the Ukraine's Communist Party. In their statement they opposed criticism expressed by delegate Nikola Selyuk from Khmelnytsk region against General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Mikhail Gorbachev. The congress decided to discuss this problem tomorrow. [passage omitted]

Today the organizational committee of the congress continued working late at night as it summarized numerous proposals expressed at the session. [passage omitted]

Ukraine Congress Views Party Committee Report

LD2006232990 Moscow TASS in English 2310 GMT
20 Jun 90

[Text] Kiev June 21 TASS—The 18th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party began discussing the report of the party Central Committee on Wednesday.

The delegates expressed their concern about the fate of the Ukrainian Communist Party, of the Ukraine and the Soviet Union on the whole, and desire to find a way to bring Soviet society out of the crisis situation.

Some speakers said that having heaved up all the burden of the perestroika problems on its shoulders, the party left neither time nor strength for its own renovation. Therefore, restructuring inside the Ukrainian Communist Party has become the most urgent task today.

Some delegates suggested that questions of a party charter, the status of the primary organisation, the setting up of commissions to check the use of the Party budget as well as the issue of Party privileges can be included in the congress' agenda.

Ukrainian communists spoke in favour of preserving democratic centralism as the basic principle of the party's organisation. It is capable of ensuring the freedom of discussion, platforms, alternatives, positions

and views, while factionalism and the federal principle of organisation will inevitably lead to a Party split.

Speaking about transition to a market economy, the delegates stressed the need to guarantee social protection to the population.

'Stormy' Debates at Ukraine Communist Congress

LD2006203390 *Moscow Domestic Service in Russian*
1800 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Correspondent Vladimir Sokolov reports on the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party [CPUK] in Kiev on 20 June]

[Text] The congress has attained a normal working rhythm today. True, its agenda, on which most of the time yesterday was spent, was still being discussed this morning. Fourteen issues have now been included in it. Since the decision has been adopted to hold the congress in two stages—before and after the 28th CPSU Congress—the agenda has been divided approximately in two halves, too. At the current stage, in particular the report-back of the Republican Communist Party Central Committee, the drafts of the CPSU platform, and party rules are to be discussed, and the first secretary of the Republican Communist Party Central Committee, other secretaries, and editors of the Republican Party newspapers are to be elected.

Discussion of the main report made yesterday "On the Political Situation and Main Guidelines of the Activity of the Ukrainian Communist Party at the Present Stage" was begun. This was, in fact, a report-back by the Central Committee; it was delivered by First Secretary Ivashko. The discussion is quite stormy. Out of the many problems raised in the report, the speakers single out, first of all, the situation in the party, its tasks in the conditions of transition to republican sovereignty and market relations. A good deal of criticism is levelled at both the CPMK Central Committee and the CPSU Central Committee in connection with the current situation in the country.

Worthy proposals and wishes have been tabled, too, of course. It is worth mentioning the activity of delegates from the rank-and-file communists. Delegates to the congress are now working in sections; the most topical problems of the life and activity of the Republican Communist Party have been submitted to their examination.

Caucasus

Iran Earthquake Causes Tremors in Azerbaijan

LD2106092990 *Moscow TASS in English* 0906 GMT
21 Jun 90

[Text] Baku June 21 TASS—Tremors from a quake in Iran, measuring from six to 6.5 on the Soviet scale, hit southern Azerbaijan at 01:01 Moscow time today.

In capital Baku, shudders measured from three to 3.5 points, according to the Azerbaijani Academy of Sciences Seismic Service.

No one was hurt. Several old buildings were damaged.

Baku Reports on Incidents at Railway Stations

NC2106073990 *Baku Domestic Service in Azeri*
1730 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Unattributed report: "The Fabrications and the Truth"]

[Text] Rumors about disturbances, which are said to have occurred in the Azerbaijan railways network, have spread beyond the republic's borders at an unprecedented pace and are echoing throughout the Soviet Union. These rumors and telegrams sent to various railway stations claim that clashes took place between local residents and the [word indistinct] who have been assigned to several railway stations in the republic in the first half of June and resulted in a number of people being injured.

What actually happened? An AZERINFORM correspondent has been informed by the transportation administration of the Azerbaijan Internal Affairs Ministry that a fire in a service area of the refrigeration section of the Moscow railway tracks at the (?Fort Ilich) railway station in southern Azerbaijan on 12 June killed two people and caused heavy property damage. An investigation revealed that the victims themselves—Kuriyev, chief of the refrigeration section, and Ryzhkov, his mechanic—were to blame for the incident. The two men, who were drunk, failed to turn off a heater before falling asleep. Some fuel in the heater spilled onto the floor and started the fire.

Meanwhile, another incident occurred at the Stepanakert railway station a few days ago. According to the information provided about this incident, workers of the Stepanakert track militia zone found the chief of the refrigeration section of the (?Zygarest) depot of the northern Caucasus railways network bleeding. He had been mercilessly beaten up by his drinking partners of the day before.

Kuliyev, chief of the transportation administration of the Azerbaijan Internal Affairs Ministry, said: the injured man is now in the hospital in serious condition. Those responsible for this brutal act—Markaryan and Gazelyan, who are [word indistinct] on freight cars, and Arutunyan, a mechanical worker employed by [name indistinct] factory—have been arrested and criminal charges will be brought against them. All three are residents of Stepanakert. The guard detail at the Stepanakert railway station has been strengthened with the help of the military servicemen from the commandant's headquarters of the state of emergency rayon to prevent further incidents. Similar preventive measures have been taken at all other stations on this track to obstruct violations of public law and order. Meanwhile, we continue to receive telegrams from workers at the railway

refrigeration sections in various rayons. These telegrams say that if workers are not protected from the lawless activities of the hooligans, they will refuse to travel along the Azerbaijan railway tracks. The uneasiness felt by the people must be taken into consideration. Meanwhile, I believe that discipline must be strengthened among the refrigeration workers who come to the republic to transport fruit and vegetables. They must be more careful and avoid being misled by [word indistinct] workers. We are doing everything possible to provide security for the people and their property in railway stations and transportation centers close to residential areas and to maintain public law and order. Furthermore, we are making efforts to explain the situation to local residents.

Russian-Speaking Refugees Returning to Baku

PM2006150190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by Senior Lieutenant U. Dzhaferov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "'Come Back, Russians!'"]

[Text] They arrive by plane, they come by train. Setting their luggage down on the ground that is warmed by the gentle Baku sun, they gaze intently at the familiar streets and familiar faces. Yesterday's refugees... People who picked up whatever belongings came to hand in their apartments and fled from Azerbaijan during the all too well-known January events in Baku. Have many of them, or just a few made the return journey? According to the latest statistics, 6,000 of the tens of thousands who left have returned to their homes—workers, servicemen, and officers' families.

It was the latter, of course, who interested me. I spoke with Lyudmila Fridrikhovna, the wife of Senior Lieutenant A. Lukash, near the entrance to a multistory block. She returned together with her two children—Sasha and Kristina. She has lived for many years in the republic's capital, and her relations with the local population have always been most friendly, but she simply could not control the feeling of fear for her family's future. And now? The situation in Baku has stabilized, life is getting into its customary groove, and her neighbors welcomed her cordially.

Of course, the return of officers' families and all those who are normally called the Russian-speaking population is not a straightforward process. Mistrust, suspicion, and fear for one's children are by no means erased from people's minds overnight. But nonetheless, the native inhabitants of multiethnic Baku are confident: The hearth of their home city has not cooled for any of its inhabitants, irrespective of their nationality.

On the front of one house I saw a garish banner evidently written by some child's hand: "Russians, please come back!" And this too is a sign of Baku today.

Turkish Religious Officials Visit Azerbaijan

NC3105094990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
0440 GMT 29 May 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] Gasan Gasanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, received a visiting delegation of Turkish religious officials. Selahattin Bayar, mufti of Istanbul, Gunes Salih, deputy mufti of Istanbul, and Professor Hayrettin Karaman, lecturer at the Theological College of Istanbul University, are among the members of the delegation.

The guests are visiting our republic at the invitation of the Spiritual Administration of the Muslims of the Transcaucasus.

Armenian Presidium Views Aftermath of 27 May

NC0306103990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0500 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] As is known, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium met recently under the chairmanship of Grant Voskanyan, its chairman. An ARMENPRES report on this points out that the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium informed the USSR Supreme Soviet that the mass media and party organs have not waited for the results of the investigations carried out by the state commission and the Armenian procuracy on the tragic incidents in Yerevan on 27 May this year, and have been unjustifiably hasty and have begun a campaign which is intended to report only one side's view of the incidents. This further exacerbates the already difficult situation in the republic and creates an unhealthy moral and psychological mood concerning the Armenian people. The Presidium categorically called for urgent steps to stop such reports which do not conform with legally accepted state norms.

The Presidium also studied the postponement of the Armenian SSR people's deputies' local soviet elections. It was pointed out that numerous proposals, decisions, and letters have been received from the people's local soviets' executive committees, labor collectives and citizens calling for the postponement of the people's deputies' elections in local soviets. In view of the proposals received, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decided to postpone the elections for the peoples' deputies' local soviets' people's deputies and decided to discuss the issue during the upcoming Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet session.

Other issues pertaining to the republic's state life were also studied and the necessary decisions were adopted.

Armenian Presidium Announcement on Elections

NC0306112390 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian
0600 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Attention, dear radio listeners. Yesterday the television and radio (?reported) on the postponement of the elections for the local soviets. The republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium clarifies that (?the announcement) concerns the rayon, city, village, and town councils and not the new round of Armenian SSR people's deputies' elections taking place today. As we all know, the people's deputies' elections in our republic took place on 20 May 1990. The reports received from the electoral okrugs indicated that in a number of electoral okrugs, the elections (?were not recognized). [passage indistinct] (?On the basis of information received) from the election committees in the okrugs, the central electoral commission reported that another round of elections would take place on 3 June 1990 in (?83) electoral okrugs. And today, 3 June, these elections are taking place in the said okrugs. The capital's electoral okrugs opened their doors to the voters early this morning. Another round of elections for the republic's people's deputies will also take place today in Kirovakan, Dilidzhan, (?Abovyan-skiy), [name indistinct], (?Artistiky), Artashatskiy, Gor-isskiy, Edzhmiatsinskiy, Kapanskiy, (?Yerevan), (?Step-anavan) and in a number of other (?rayons) of the republic.

The (?situation) in the republic indicates more and more (?the need for the (?convocation) of our parliament [words indistinct].

Georgia, Armenia Fail To Stop Draft-Dodging

PM2006111590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 17 Jun 90 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Lieutenant General V. Samsonov, Transcaucasus Military District chief of staff, by own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction; place and date of interview not stated: "The Draft in the Transcaucasus. It Is Being Carried Out in an Extremely Complex Situation This Year"]

[Text] Yes, that's how it is. Plans are collapsing in ruins, the telephone lines at the district staff are jammed, and officers in the directorates have received heaps of concerned telegrams. Representatives from the localities have one question: Where are the people who should be entering the army? Indeed, where are they? How will all this affect the Armed Forces' combat readiness? However, it seems that such questions do not particularly worry those who are organizing powerful propagandist attacks on the army in the mass media. Induction centers are picketed, military commissariats are blockaded, and there are ultimatums, hunger strikes, strikes by draft commission physicians...

We asked Lieutenant General V. Samsonov, chief of staff of the Transcaucasus Military District, to comment on the prevailing situation.

[Kaushanskiy] As is well known, local soviet organs are now in fact responsible for the draft under the USSR Council of Ministers resolution of 29 March. And, incidentally, the Transcaucasus republics' councils of ministers have also adopted their own resolutions.

[Samsonov] Yes, they have. And published them in the open press. With the exception of Georgia, though. That document was published in the republic bearing the stamp "For official use," which is quite incomprehensible. And what was the result? Soviet ispolkoms [executive committees in 10 of the republic's cities and rayons] failed to adopt resolutions on the draft, young men had no medical certification in 15, and in approximately 30 rayons not one was called for military service. The number of objectors in Georgia is around 7,000, while around 3,000 future servicemen are demanding to carry out their service on the republic's territory. As of today, approximately 16 percent of the planned number of people have been sent to join the troops in Georgia.

[Kaushanskiy] Objectors continue to feel that they are not going to be punished. I don't think I've heard of a single court case resulting from young men avoiding military service...

[Samsonov] I came back from Abkhazia a few days ago. I had determined to investigate particularly the problem of organizing the spring draft in the rural backwater of Ochamchirskiy and Galskiy Rayons. I met with raykom [rayon party committee] secretaries, local soviet chairmen, prosecutors, and so on. Their position is simple: All their organizational work is going down the drain because of the frenzied anti-army campaign in the press and on television. On the one hand, they say, we are invited to hold a dialogue, and on the other the mass media slam their doors on us, preferring a monologue instead, and a monologue in an accusing tone, at that. The situation surrounding the deaths of Georgians in the Army, allegedly through the acute hostility of Russian commanders—"old men"—toward them continues to be pumped up.

I suggested that every death be made public, with the documents made available. I did not receive a reply. One prosecutor said to me: "How can I put a boy in prison when he tells me that he became an objector because he was afraid that he might be declared an enemy of the nation at a rally. If we could only isolate the main instigators, those who appeal to people to violate the USSR Constitution..."

[Kaushanskiy] Shouldn't we trace at least one day of the draft in the Transcaucasus republics, citing figures?

[Samsonov] Let's look together at the reports. Here is 6 June, for example. Georgia should have dispatched 2,23 draftees, but only 13 went; Armenia did not dispatch a single man when it should have sent off 143. In Azerbaijan, the planned figure was 965, and 957 went. Draw your conclusions.

[Kaushanskiy] And what regions were they sent to?

[Samsonov] Minsk, Volgograd, Moscow, Lvov, Odessa, Vilnius... Note, not the provinces, or some godforsaken corner.

[Kaushanskiy] Why did Azerbaijan make a relatively favorable showing?

[Samsonov] Because the republic government involved all possible instruments in the draft campaign: the press, war and labor veterans, and the public. Employees at military commissariats received tangible support from local organs, whose representatives did not consider it a big effort to go to enterprises and families.

[Kaushanskiy] The total "zero" from Armenia, it must be admitted, makes a painful impression.

[Samsonov] These are the echoes of that extraordinary 3 May session of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet. It was that session that created a deputies' commission to study "cases of discrimination against Armenian servicemen in the Soviet Army on a national basis" and put a temporary stop to the draft. Instead, there are instances of thugs from the so-called Armenian peoples' army recruiting their reinforcements from guys of draft age.

[Kaushanskiy] Can you make any predictions for the future?

[Samsonov] Let us wait for the finish and not make guesses. A lot of things are being done. And on many levels. The main thing today is to strictly carry out the spirit and letter of the Soviet laws.

Georgian Informals Propose Law on Parties

90US1028A Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian
26 May 90 p 2

[Unattributed article: "Law on Parties: There Is a Proposal"]

[Text] The social organization "Democratic Elections in Georgia"—(DAS)—has published its own draft Law on Parties. It is assumed that all political parties that exist de facto in the republic will join in a consideration of this document.

The draft was developed jointly with the Green Party of Georgia and the Liberal-Democratic National Party. The Republicans-Federalists also took part in its preparation. The document was submitted to the Supreme Soviet of Georgia as a legislative initiative. The Law on Parties must be adopted before the forthcoming elections to the higher legislative organ of the republic—this is the general belief today. But what should it be? The first version, submitted to the court of public opinion, even as a draft can evoke criticism both from the right and the left. Article 2 of the document states the requirement for absolute depoliticization of the organs of justice, arbitration, prosecuting attorney, internal affairs, state security, constitutional oversight, and the army. These categories

of workers, according to the draft, must either withdraw from all political parties or stop their membership in them. A procedure exists in the republic today under which the registration of sociopolitical organizations is a prerogative of the Council of Ministers. Georgia was the first to adopt a law which allowed informals to become officially registered legal entities. However, the law virtually did not work. The draft proposes another principle for the establishment of a party: it assumes all rights and is considered established from the day of publication of its statute. After the publication of the statute, citizens and state institutions and organizations have the right to demand that this party be banned, and in such an event they must institute legal proceedings in a court of law. One of the provisions, according to which the court can issue a decision on banning a political party, attracts particular attention. The ban is legal "if the party is subordinate to a political party that exists outside the boundaries of the Georgian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], or if it constitutes a structural part of it." The implication is quite transparent. The requirement for maximum glasnost in the financial-economic affairs of the party can be categorized as an unquestionably positive quality of the document that was submitted.

Georgian Multiparty Elections Seen in Prospect

LD2006225290 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2150 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Eduard Gasparov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 20 Jun (TASS)—A law on the basic principles of Georgia's economic independence was adopted at its first reading at a session of the republic's Supreme Soviet which took place here today. A law on alternative (labor) service was approved as a whole.

An appeal from the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet was adopted. It proposes that there be an examination of the circumstances of the events of 1921, as a result of which Georgia became a Soviet republic, and that they be given a political and legal appraisal. It emphasizes that such an act will serve as the basis "for the establishment between the Georgian SSR and the RSFSR of the genuinely equal and mutually beneficial relations characteristic of sovereign states".

For the purpose of creating the "legal mechanism for the restoration of Georgia's state independence" it was decided to form a commission of deputies and specialists and also representatives of political parties, sociopolitical associations, and movements. It was decided, with the involvement of the public at large, to complete and submit for discussion at the next session a draft law on Georgian citizenship and also a draft law on general democratic multiparty elections of the republic's Supreme Soviet. They are scheduled for 28 October 1990.

At the suggestion of the deputies the session adopted a statement of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet which

recognizes "the right to self-determination and the political will of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and of all Union republics to create genuinely sovereign states" and expressed a readiness to establish direct interstate political, economic, and other mutual relations.

Georgia Soviet Proposes Sovereignty Commission

*LD2006193790 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 20 Jun 90*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An extraordinary session of the Georgia Supreme Soviet took place in Tbilisi today:

[Correspondent N. Gongadze] The deputies assembled somewhat earlier than planned since representatives of the public and the young people of the republic, including a group of students from Tbilisi University, had raised issues requiring the most rapid adoption of a number of laws and the fixing of a precise date for the upcoming elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet. Incidentally, these elections in Georgia will be the first in the country to be held on a legitimized multiparty basis.

Additions to the decision on guarantees for the protection of Georgia's state sovereignty were examined today. The establishment of a commission to elaborate a legal mechanism for restoring state sovereignty was proposed, as was the continuation of work on the draft law on citizenship; on universal, democratic, and multiparty elections; and on social organizations and political parties. The deputies adopted the law on the foundations of economic independence on first reading, as well as laws on the legal regulation of alternative service and on evaluating a number of USSR laws on the basis of Article 77 of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Constitution. Election day was also fixed: it will be this 28 October. With this, the session of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet concluded its work.

Addenda, Draft Laws To Be Discussed

*LD2006164990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1500 GMT 20 Jun 90*

[Text] Deputies in Tbilisi are examining the issue of introducing addenda to the decision of the republican Supreme Soviet on the guarantees for defending Georgia's state sovereignty. A package of draft laws will be discussed, too. They include draft laws on universal democratic elections of the Supreme Soviet, on the foundations of economic independence, and on other issues.

Central Asia

Uzbek 'Declaration of Sovereignty' Clarified

*LD2006162190 Moscow TASS in English 1604 GMT
20 Jun 90*

[“Urgent—Uzbek parliament adopts sovereignty declaration”—TASS headline; by TASS correspondent Vladimir Pruger]

[Text] Tashkent June 20 TASS—A “Declaration of Sovereignty of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Within a Renewed Soviet Federation” was passed at a session of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet in Tashkent today after heated debates. (TASS has earlier erroneously reported the title of the document as the “Declaration of Independence”)

The declaration proclaims Uzbekistan's state sovereignty and the supremacy of republican laws on its entire territory.

The declaration puts all issues of domestic and foreign policy under the authority of Uzbekistan.

The document emphasises that Uzbekistan acknowledges and respects principles of international law and determines the nature and foundations that underlie its future economic, cultural and other relations with foreign countries.

The proposal to discuss the draft of this declaration on the first day of the session was not backed by deputies. Some of them believed that the issue should be postponed until a new union treaty, defining relations between union republics and the union on the whole, is concluded.

Supporters of the declaration won the discussion, however, and the declaration was approved by the majority of votes.

The session of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet also focused on bills on land, ownership and on creating a committee for constitutional compliance.

The deputies are planning measures to improve the status of women and to protect motherhood and childhood in the republic.

Premier Comments on Declaration

*LD2006190890 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1700 GMT 20 Jun 90*

[Report by correspondent M. Ganiyev, including recorded interview with Sh.P. Mirsaidov, chairman of the Uzbek Council of Ministers, in Tashkent on 20 June; all participants identified by screen caption; from the “Vremya” newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] During today's session of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet, deputies passed a declaration on the independence [nezavisimost] of the republic.

[Ganiyev] An initiative group of 65 deputies distributed the text of the declaration at the session. It was discussed in the commissions and small changes were made. The new version of the declaration was read out by Comrade Mirsaidov, chairman of the republican Council of Ministers. Following an hour's discussion, the declaration of independence was basically adopted.

[Begin recording] [Ganiyev] Does the declaration provide for independence in a federation with the union republics, or in a confederation?

[Mirsaidov] The main thing is how we are going to provide for the prosperity of working people. If the prosperity of working people is going to be ensured at an accelerated rate within the framework of a federation, we back a federation; if in the framework of a confederation, we back a confederation; if in the framework of interstate relations, we back interstate relations. But if this does not ensure prosperity for the working people and does not get us out of the crisis that has arisen, then we will be obliged to ponder the situation together with the deputies. I think that the declaration is a declaration that will lie at the basis of our Constitution and will serve as a basis for our new law on independence. [end recording]

[Ganiyev] Yes, the prime minister of the republic was expressing the view of many deputies in Uzbekistan. However, there were other proposals in the republican parliament too. It appears that there will still be many arguments over the declaration, but we will have to wait and see, as the saying goes. The session of the Uzbek Supreme Soviet ended its proceedings today.

Information Report on Uzbek Supreme Soviet

LD2006194790 Tashkent Domestic Service in Uzbek
0115 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Here is an information report on the sitting of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. Yesterday in Tashkent the second session of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR continued its work. The morning session was opened by Ibragimov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR. Khabibullayev, chairman of the commission for the preparation of the draft law, delivered a speech on the draft law on constitutional supervision in the Uzbek SSR.

People's deputies adopted the basis of the draft and proposed a commission [word indistinct] for the approval of the Supreme Soviet, taking into consideration the stated observations and proposals. [passage omitted]

Following this the platform was given to Mirsaidov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Uzbek SSR. He informed the people's deputies on the measures being adopted by the government of the republic for the transition to a regulated market economy and answered questions. The deputies, taking into consideration the information, instructed the government to work out a

system for the transition to a regulated market economy and [word indistinct] represent it to the Supreme Soviet for examination.

Deputy Rakhmanova, chairman of the permanent commission for public health, women, protection of motherhood and childhood, delivered a speech on the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet on urgent measures for the improvement of the condition of women, protection of motherhood and childhood, and the strengthening of families.

[Word indistinct] sitting was opened by Bugrov, deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR. [passage omitted] The Supreme Soviet adopted on this question a draft resolution as a basis. The commission has been instructed to generalize on the proposals put forward and present them for the approval of deputies. Ibragimov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR and the government, spoke at the sitting with information on the progress of the implementation of the resolution of the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the Uzbek SSR about the proposals on the changes and additions to the USSR Law on general military duty. [passage omitted]

At the sitting the question of the chairman of the Committee for People's Control of the Uzbek SSR was examined. Mirkasymov was elected chairman of the Committee for People's Control of the republic. [passage omitted]

At the session Karimov, the president of the Uzbek SSR and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party, spoke. The session continues its work.

Uzbeks Take First Steps Toward Economic Autonomy

PM1906143990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent Andrey Orlov report: "On the Road to Independence"]

[Text] Tashkent—New state structures have been set up in Uzbekistan by decree of the republic's president I. Karimov.

The Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers has been instructed to set up a State Committee for Foreign Trade and Foreign Relations and a Main Administration for the Supply and Sale of Raw Materials and Light Industry Products.

These are the first practical steps on the road to economic autonomy for the republic. The new departments will implement a unified foreign and domestic economic policy, develop business contacts with Soviet and foreign partners, and represent Uzbekistan's interests in the union and abroad.

Among the priority tasks are the conclusion on a mutually advantageous and equal basis of treaties for the

supply of cotton fiber, silk cocoons, leather, and fur produced in the republic. Union organs' monopoly on the distribution of the main kinds of raw materials will thus be removed.

Internal Affairs Ministry on Kirghizia Situation

*LD2006145190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1300 GMT 20 Jun 90*

[Text] Representatives of the provisional press center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] in Kirghizia report:

Over the past 24 hours, the situation in Frunze has not been aggravated. Infringements of the law on interethnic grounds have not been registered. In Osh Oblast the situation is under control. In this oblast center, all enterprises of public catering, trade and communications' centers are working.

Since the events began on 4 June, 187 people in the oblast have died as a result of the mass disturbances, including two staffers of internal affairs bodies and one serviceman. Some 1,275 have been wounded, including 43 militia staff and three servicemen. According to verified data, in Osh Oblast 452 instances of arson have been registered and 629 firearms have been confiscated.

End of Kirghiz Communist Party Congress Reported

*PM1906133190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3*

[Report by correspondent Gennadiy Shipitko: "Kirghiz Communist Party Congress Ends"]

[Text] Frunze—A. Masaliyev, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, has been reelected Central Committee first secretary after a secret ballot.

For two days the congress delegates strove to define communists' role and place in the republic's economic and political life. The CPSU Central Committee draft platform and draft CPSU statutes were basically supported.

Attempts were made at the congress to rehabilitate leaders who had previously compromised themselves and to call into question the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat resolution adopted in 1987 on the nationalist

manifestations in Kirghizia. As A. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee, reported, "Study of the alleged nationalist manifestations in Kirghizia" showed that "facts had been superficially interpreted and unsubstantiated conclusions drawn."

This claim hardly squares with the interethnic conflict that has taken place and whose consequences will not soon be overcome. As the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs reported, as a result of operational detective work new victims of the conflict have come to light. They total 174 people. The state of emergency in the capital and in Osh Oblast remains in force.

The congress delegates elected a new Central Committee and Auditing Commission.

Thousands Homeless After Kazakhstan Quake

LD1906211890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 19 June on the "Vremya" newscast broadcasts a video report on the aftermath of the earthquake in Kazakhstan. Correspondent D. Baimbetov reports. The video shows demolished buildings, dazed people, piles of belongings, and group of officials touring the site.

According to Baimbetov, the most noticeable damage occurred in Zaysanskiy, Kurchumskiy, Zyryanovskiy, Tarbagatayskiy, and Markakolskiy Rayons. He says unconfirmed reports claim about 8,000 houses have been destroyed and over 25,500 people left homeless. The epicenter was in a village in Zaysanskiy Rayon where the tremor was force eight.

Baimbetov says that fortunately, the quake occurred when the villagers were working in the fields and farms and the old people and children were out in the streets, so the number of victims was minimal. A child of two was killed and 15 people were injured. Baimbetov says all efforts are now being geared to eliminating the consequences of the earthquake with an emergency commission of the Kazakh Council of Ministers determining the extent of the damage and the amount of rebuilding to be done. The republican president and first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, Nazarbayev, visited the disaster area.